

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

NOVEMBER, 1843.

THE EARLY LITERARY HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

NO. IV.

THE FIRST DISTINCT NOTICES OF CHRISTIANITY BY HEATHEN
WRITERS.

THE next division of our remarks upon the general subject of the Early History of Christianity, leads us to review the explicit statements which are found in the first classical writings where our religion and its disciples are noticed.

Two of the most valuable and interesting writers of ancient Rome, whose works are preserved to us, are Tacitus and the younger Pliny. Their testimony to Christianity is of the highest importance; and neither the most searching scrutiny of Christians, nor the most daring skepticism of unbelievers, has been able to invalidate the proud arguments for our faith which we found upon it. These two authors were most intimate friends, and revised each other's writings before publication. Pliny was born in the year 61 or 62. We do not know the year when Tacitus was born; but as Pliny, in a letter to him (Lib. vii. Ep. 20,) says that he, Tacitus, was already flourishing in fame and distinction, while his friend was but a youth, we conclude that Tacitus was some years older than Pliny,—that he was born before or about A. D. 50. In the year 78, Tacitus married the daughter of Agricola, the famous Roman Consul and Governor of Britain. Tacitus filled several offices of distinguished honor and trust under various emperors. He wrote an account of Germany, and a Life of Agricola, to-

gether with several books of annals, extending from the accession of Augustus, A. D. 14, to the death of Nero, A. D. 68,— besides a history from the accession of Galba, A. D. 68, to the death of Domitian, A. D. 96. Both these latter works are very imperfect. The first five books of his annals are preserved entire, and other five are missing; after which we have the continuation; and it is here that the famous and invaluable passage occurs, which he little thought, when he wrote it, would be so much esteemed by Christians. Here is a good opportunity to repeat a remark which we have before made. This passage has been preserved in its proper connection, as we say in common phrase, by mere accident. Friends and foes, time and decay, have spared it, while other portions of the author's works are lost, it may be irrecoverably. Many Christians have propped up a tottering faith by reading this passage, because it has afforded them so clear, distinct, and undeniable testimony, that in the year 63 the Christians were found in Rome in great numbers, were treated with dire and fiendish cruelty, and in their worst sufferings found the faith, the doctrine, and the example of their Master sufficient. It is natural for all of us to find comfort and strength in such historical testimony. Christianity must be sustained by historical verifications. But such verifications are not to be sought for only in the express notices of the beginning and progress of our faith from authors who, for various reasons, had given it no attention. The existence of the Christian records and the Christian church,—the necessity of admitting a beginning to the faith which is now triumphant and unassailable,—these are the larger historical verifications of Christianity. The allusions to it in the works of heathen authors, the mistaken superficial views which they accidentally present of it, are merely incidental and occasional. They join in here and there upon the great unbroken chain of evidence, and sometimes double its links. The history of Christianity would not have been a whit less true, if Tacitus had never written the passage we are now to read; and if, after he had written it, the part of his works which contained it had been lost, as are other parts, we might have lamented the absence from his writings of any confirmatory evidence of our faith, but we could not on that account have been justified in doubting the mass of evidence which we possess. We must establish in our minds this legitimate principle of reasoning. Accident, as we say, has preserved the passage of Tacitus; accident then

might have lost it. There may be other passages of equal value in the portions of his works which are lost. What then? There are Christians, Christian records, and a Christian church. Where did they come from? The answer to that question leads along the direct chain of historical evidence, from our own time, back to the origin of Christianity. The passages from heathen writers, which we are now to quote, are to be regarded as incidental allusions to Christianity, as for one moment and no longer it arrested the attention of men, who probably never entertained a thought about investigating its history or character.

Tacitus wrote about A. D. 100, — certainly not later. In the year of Christ 63, one year after Paul had left Rome to pursue his Apostolic journeys, Nero was Emperor of Rome; he had come to supreme power in the year 54, at the age of 17; consequently in the year 63 he was 26 years old. He was one of the foulest monsters that ever polluted a throne. By the assistance of his mother he poisoned the son of her husband, and afterwards put her to death, as he did also his tutors, Burrhus and Seneca, his two wives, one of whom was the daughter of his adopted father, and the poet Lucan, with many others of lesser note. He disgraced himself by performing in the public theatres, having soldiers stationed as spies among the spectators, to inform him of any who passed unfavorable criticisms upon him. He said he was willing to be hated, if he could only be feared. His extravagance was unbounded; his sensuality disgusting and revolting. Though he maintained a sort of influence over the people, by distributing bribes and means of pleasure, he was hated as a monster. The Senate at last revolted and took part in the conspiracies against him. To avoid the fate which he knew awaited him, he committed suicide, in the year 68, his death being followed by popular manifestations of joy.

In the year 63, there occurred in Rome the most awful and devastating conflagration ever recorded to have happened in a time of peace. Four of the Roman writers give an account of it as unparalleled in memory or example,—Tacitus, Suetonius, Dion Cassius, and Orosius. The fire continued nine days, during which the most splendid monuments, temples, and works of Grecian and Roman art, were crumbled into black ruins. The city was then divided into fourteen wards; of these three were entirely destroyed, seven were reduced to a melancholy condition of partial desolation, and only four escaped without

injury. The government took active measures for the relief of the sufferers, erecting temporary sheds, distributing corn and provisions, and opening the gardens of the Emperor as a common shelter. The city was subsequently rebuilt, in a more regular, commodious, and magnificent style. But before a thought of restoration had been cherished, in the midst of the agonies and the melancholy havoc of the desolation, the busy tongue of rumor was speculating upon the authors of the conflagration. Amid the ruins of heathen splendor, the first general persecution of the disciples of Jesus Christ was devised. The people were determined to discover the cause of the calamity. First they had recourse to the temples of their gods, as Tacitus informs us; they presented oblations and offerings to Vulcan, Ceres, and Proserpine; Juno was propitiated by the Roman matrons, the Sibylline books were consulted, but all to no purpose. Rumor accused Nero himself of having set fire to the city, either that he might exercise his extravagant fondness for sumptuous edifices by rebuilding it, or that he might enjoy the scene as a fair representation of the flames of Troy. The monster was thought to be every way capable of the deed, for no cruelty or sin had as yet found him unwilling to be tempted. It was observed too that he was lavish in distributing relief to the people. He led them to the temples, and told them to appease the anger of the gods. We can now take the words of Tacitus as to what followed.

“But neither all human help, nor the liberality of the Emperor, nor all the atonements presented to the gods, availed to abate the infamy he lay under of having ordered the city to be set on fire. To suppress therefore this common rumor, Nero procured others to be accused, and inflicted exquisite punishment upon those people, who were in abhorrence for their crimes, and were commonly known by the name of Christians. They had their denomination from Christus, who in the reign of Tiberius was put to death as a criminal by the Procurator, Pontius Pilate. This pernicious superstition, though checked for a while, broke out again, and spread, not only over Judea, the source of this evil, but reached the city also; whither flow from all quarters all things vile and shameful, and where they find shelter and encouragement. At first they only were apprehended who confessed themselves of that sect; afterwards a vast multitude discovered by them; all which were condemned, not so much for the crime of burning the city as for their enmity to mankind. Their executions were so contrived as to

expose them to derision and contempt. Some were covered over with the skins of wild beasts, and torn to pieces by dogs; some were crucified; others, having been daubed over with combustible materials, were set up as lights in the night time, and thus burned to death. Nero made use of his own gardens as a theatre upon this occasion, and also exhibited the diversions of the circus, sometimes standing in the crowd as a spectator, in the habit of a charioteer; at other times driving a chariot himself; till at length these men, though really criminal and deserving exemplary punishment, began to be commiserated as people who were destroyed, not out of a regard to the public welfare, but only to gratify the cruelty of one man."

Such is the remarkable passage, the genuineness of which no skeptic or unbeliever ever presumed to question. Indeed the contents of the passage would afford full evidence of their author. It is written in the beautiful style of Tacitus, in his own classic language, with the mixture of philosophy and fact in the composition of history for which he is remarkable. Moreover the most untrue, superficial, and strange idea, which the author of this passage must have had of Christianity, is precisely in accordance with that which Tacitus, a proud and distinguished man, the companion of Emperors, the Consul, and the superintendent of pagan sacrificial rites, would have formed of Christianity.

What a mass of evidence and of valuable information is gathered in this passage! It asserts the execution of Christ by Pontius Pilate, — the perpetuation of his name and sentiments among his followers, — the prevalence of the faith in Judea where it arose, and its wide dissemination, in spite of the ignominious death of its author and the resistance of authority to his religion, — that Christians were generally hated, — that they were so numerous at Rome, during the year 63, as to serve as victims of popular fury for popular suffering. Tacitus likewise bears witness to the awful sufferings of the Christians, and says nothing of their resistance or complaints. More than all, Tacitus adds that their sufferings excited compassion, and were believed to be not so much the punishment of guilt, as the inflictions of cruelty. Tacitus says Nero was absent from Rome at Antium, on the sea coast, about thirty miles distant, when the fire broke out. This, however, would not disprove the charge against him of having employed incendiaries. He returned in season to see his own palace fall before the flames.

As the murderer of his nearest relatives and friends, and then of himself, he was well fitted for the deed, and after he had done it, he might well charge it upon the Christians.

A few remarks may be made upon this passage from Tacitus. The Christians, he says, were "a people held in abhorrence for their crimes," "their religion was a pernicious superstition." We may smile at such a description, from a votary of heathenism, of the religion of the New Testament. All that we need say is, that it is an evidence how little he knew of it. As for the crimes which he speaks of, he speaks only from common report; he utters the popular opinion of his day and nation concerning the Christians—that in their secret midnight worship they were guilty of impiety toward the Roman deities—they sacrificed infants—they formed pledges of fellowship in sin—they introduced a new God, viz. Christus—they hated all men, i. e. they abstained from the common heathen amusements, games, drinking ceremonies, &c.; they would not bow before the statues of the deities, nor throw incense upon their altars. Such were the crimes which rumor charged upon the Christians. "They came likewise from Judea"—the home of a despicable race—the hot-bed of sedition and impiety, as the Romans thought. Yet they did not keep friendship with their own countrymen—the Jews,—but were in contest with them as with the rest of the world. Their doctrine had been checked for a while, says Tacitus, viz. by the crucifixion of Christ; but in spite of this they had spread even to Rome. When Nero ventured to shift from himself to the Christians the odium of the awful calamity, he probably knew that popular fury could easily be turned against them. It was not simply that they were a foreign sect. There were many foreign sects in Rome; but these were well known, and had all of them common points in form and tenet. The Christians were a new sect, and had no single point in common with the idolaters around them. The evidence of more than one Christian writer would have been thought necessary to confirm such an account of their savage treatment by Nero. But Tacitus leads the long list of those who have referred to it, with his explicit and undeniable testimony. On the spot where Nero thus set on fire his innocent victims, the historian tells us, were his own imperial circus and gardens, and there now stands the Church of St. Peter, an imperishable monument of the faith, which there entrusted its life and honor to a few feeble

men and women, but lately cleansed from the slime of heathenism, yet made strong in the love and hope of Christian converts.

There is another statement in the works of Tacitus worthy of brief notice. He gives a slight sketch of the Jewish war, and of the destruction of Jerusalem. In the midst of the factions which prevailed in the devoted city, he says:—"There were many prodigies for signifying their ruin, which were not to be averted by all the sacrifices and vows of that people, superstitious in their own way of worship, though different from all others. Armies were seen fighting in the air with brandished weapons. A fire fell upon the Temple from the clouds. Its doors were suddenly opened. At the same time there was a loud voice declaring that the gods were removing, which was accompanied with a sound as of a multitude going out. All which things were supposed by some to portend great calamities. But the most had a strong persuasion, that it was said in the ancient writings of the priests, that at that very time the East should prevail, and that some who came from Judea should obtain the empire of the world." An allusion to the general expectation of the Messiah.

Martial, a distinguished writer of epigrams, and an intimate acquaintance of the learned men of the time of Nero and thirty years afterwards, was born in Spain, and is supposed to have been in Rome while Nero reigned. He is thought to refer to the patient suffering of the Christians, while being rolled up in sheets covered with pitch they were burnt. He says:—"You have perhaps lately seen acted in the theatre, Mucius, who thrust his hand into the fire. If you think such an one valiant and stout, you are a mere dotard. For it is a much greater thing when threatened with a pitch coat, to say, 'I do not sacrifice,' than to obey the command, 'burn the hand.'"

Juvenal, a Latin poet who flourished about A. D. 100, is supposed to refer to the Christians in these lines, describing their punishment. "Describe a great villain, like Tigellinus, (a servant of Nero,) and you shall suffer the same punishment with those who stand burning in their own flame, with a stake under their chin, and a stream of blood and sulphur running from them."

Suetonius, the author of the lives of the first twelve Cæsars, flourished in the reign of Trajan and afterwards, and wrote about A. D. 110.—He was a friend and correspondent of the younger Pliny. In his life of the Emperor Claudius,

who reigned from A. D. 41 to 54, he says : — “ He banished the Jews from Rome, who were continually making disturbances, Chrestus being their leader.” He here confounds the Jews and Christians, and misnames the Messiah. We read in the Acts, (xviii. 2,) that “ Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome.”

In his life of Nero, he says : — “ The Christians were punished, a sort of men of a new and magical superstition.”

In his life of Vespasian, speaking of the Jewish war, he says : — “ There had been for a long time all over the East a prevailing opinion, that it was in the fates that at that time some one from Judea should obtain the empire of the world.”

The next author, whose works afford to us a most valuable testimony to early Christianity, is the younger Pliny, the nephew and adopted son of the elder Pliny. His uncle was a Roman knight, born at Verona, a distinguished lawyer, scholar, and naturalist. He lost his life by his eagerness to observe the famous eruption of Vesuvius, A. D. 79, which destroyed Pompeii and Herculaneum. His nephew observed it at a distance, but would not accompany his uncle, who was found near the sea shore suffocated by the sulphurous vapor. His nephew was born at Como, A. D. 62. He was likewise distinguished for his attainments. He was prætor, præfect, augur, consul, and about A. D. 106 was appointed by the Emperor Trajan, Governor of Pontus in Bithynia, south of the Euxine Sea, where he remained nearly two years. With all his cultivation and knowledge, he was profoundly superstitious, either from sincere belief, or from affected reverence. His works abound with devout addresses to the gods, and to the divine guardians of the Roman Empire. He sent a curious relic, a statue of brass, which he had purchased at some cost, not to a museum, but to be deposited in a Temple of Jupiter in his native city. He erected and consecrated temples. In a letter to a friend, who was sent to Achaia, he says : — “ You will consider yourself as sent to that noble province of Achaia, the true original Greece. Revere the gods, their founders, those venerable deities. Respect the ancient glory of this people. Pay a regard to their antiquity, to their noble exploits, and even to their fictions.” Pliny sought of Trajan the office of augur, or priest — which obliged him to lead the sacrifices, to interpret dreams and prodigies, and to make predictions. He approved of gladiatorial shows. Trajan likewise, had many good points, but he was superstitious, and not strictly moral.

Of the works of Pliny there are preserved to us ten books of letters, and a panegyric upon Trajan. In the tenth book of his letters we find his correspondence with the Emperor. The other letters are addressed to Tacitus, Suetonius, and other distinguished men of the time. They are of a high character.

The following is his remarkable Letter to the Emperor:—

“It is my constant custom, Sir, to refer myself to you in all matters concerning which I have any doubt. For who can better direct me where I hesitate, or instruct me where I am ignorant? I have never been present at any trials of Christians; so that I know not well what is the subject-matter of punishment, or of inquiry, or what strictness ought to be used in either. Nor have I been a little perplexed to determine whether any difference ought to be made on account of age, or whether the young and tender, and the full grown and robust, ought to be treated all alike; whether repentance should entitle to pardon, or whether all who have once been Christians ought to be punished, though they are now no longer so; whether the name itself, although no crimes be detected, or crimes only belonging to the name, ought to be punished. Concerning all these things I am in doubt. In the mean time I have taken this course with all who have been brought before me, and have been accused as Christians. I have put the question to them, whether they were Christians. Upon their confessing to me that they were, I repeated the question a second and a third time, threatening also to punish them with death. Such as still persisted, I ordered away to be punished; for there was no doubt with me, whatever might be the nature of their opinion, that contumacy and inflexible obstinacy ought to be punished. There were others of the same infatuation, whom, because they are Roman citizens, I have noted down to be sent to the city. In a short time, the crime spreading itself, even whilst under persecution, as is usual in such cases, divers sorts of people came in my way. An information was presented to me, without mentioning the author, containing the names of many persons, who upon examination denied that they were Christians, or had ever been so; who repeated after me an invocation of the gods, and with wine and frankincense made supplication to your image, which for that purpose I have caused to be brought and set before them, together with the statues of deities. Moreover they reviled the name of Christ. None of which things, as is said, they, who are really Christians, can by any means be compelled to do. These therefore I thought proper to discharge.

Others were named by an informer, who at first confessed themselves Christians, and afterwards denied it. The rest said they had been Christians but had left them, some three years ago, some longer, and one, or more, above twenty years. They all worshipped your image, and the statues of the gods; these also reviled Christ. They affirmed that the whole of their fault, or error, lay in this, that they were wont to meet together on a stated day before it was light, and sing among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ, as a god, and bind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of theft, or robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to them, when called upon to return it. When these things were performed, it was their custom to separate, and then to come together again to a meal, which they ate in common, without any disorder; but this they had forborne since the publication of my edict, by which, according to your commands, I prohibited assemblies. After receiving this account, I judged it the more necessary to examine, and that by torture, two maid servants, which were called ministers; but I have discovered nothing, beside a bad and excessive superstition.

Suspending, therefore, all judicial proceedings, I have recourse to you for advice; for it has appeared unto me a matter highly deserving consideration, especially upon account of the great number of persons who are in danger of suffering. For many of all ages and every rank, of both sexes likewise, are accused, and will be accused. Nor has the contagion of this superstition seized cities only, but the lesser towns also, and the open country. Nevertheless it seems to me that it may be restrained and corrected. It is certain that the temples, which were almost forsaken, begin to be more frequented. And the sacred solemnities after a long intermission, are revived. Victims likewise are every where bought up, whereas for some time there were few purchasers. Whence it is easy to imagine what numbers of men might be reclaimed, if pardon were granted to those who shall repent."

To this letter from Pliny, the Emperor Trajan answered:—

"You have taken the right method, my Pliny, in your proceedings with those who have been brought before you as Christians; for it is impossible to establish any one rule that shall hold universally. They are not to be sought for. If any are brought before you, and are convicted, they ought to be punished. However, he that denies his being a Christian, and makes it evident in fact, that is, by supplicating to our gods,

though he be suspected to have been so formerly, let him be pardoned upon repentance. But in no case of any crime whatever may a bill of information be received, without being signed by him who presents it; for that would be a dangerous precedent, and unworthy of my government."

These letters are all the more valuable to us, because they comprise all the information which we possess relative to the sufferings of the Christians in Pontus and Bithynia. The early Christian writers using these letters repeat their contents, but add no new particulars. Pliny wrote within sixty years after the Apostles were authorized to offer the Christian faith to Gentiles. We may prize these letters as of inexpressible value to us, and in reviewing their contents, we may follow them with some remarks.

Pliny was in the habit of seeking advice from the Emperor, as he had probably been instructed to do. On this occasion, the vast importance of the subject, to those whom he governed, demanded that he should be very considerate. Pliny does not define to the Emperor who the Christians were, supposing he would know all about them — thus attesting their number and their diffusion over the Empire. He speaks of their trials likewise, as a familiar matter, though he had never happened to have attended one. By his inquiry how he should proceed, we learn that there were then no general edicts in force against the Christians; when he went to his province, those of Nero and Domitian having been repealed. He mercifully suggests to the Emperor to allow a distinction in the treatment of the young and the mature. Pliny gives us a hint, which is confirmed by other early documents, that the name alone of Christian, without the proof of any crime, deserved punishment. He asks if he is to follow that rule or not. The hint is valuable, as proving that, while the fiercest persecution was waged against the Christians, some of the oppressors already doubted, whether any crime at all could be charged against those whose principal fault was their hated name. He acknowledges that he had put to death some, who resolutely replied to his thrice repeated question that they were Christians. In endeavoring to bring them back to heathenism, he probably used some such reasoning as was addressed to the martyr Polycarp: — "What harm, is it to say, Lord Cæsar, and sacrifice; and love your life? — Reverence thine age. Swear by Cæsar's fortune. Repent, swear, and reproach Christ, and I will dismiss thee."

He certainly was most unreasonable in saying, that their obstinacy ought to be punished, whether their opinions were right or wrong. Besides putting some to death, which he had not a shadow of right to do, he tore others from their homes, who claimed the privileges of Roman citizens, and subjected them to the suffering of being sent to the capital. What became of them we can only conjecture; probably they might as well have met their fate at home. It seems that by secret accusation many were wrongfully charged as Christians, and escaped by acknowledging the Emperor as a god. Perhaps such persons had been heard to speak against the persecution of the Christians. However, when the prætor had them in his power, he proceeded rigidly with them, obliging them to follow him in a prescribed form of invoking the gods. Some acknowledged their profession when first asked, but being intimidated by threats, denied it when the question was repeated. The timid, the half-convinced, acted then just as they would act now. Some too had apostatized after a long profession, either through disappointment, interest, or fear. If any evidence were needed to verify the authenticity of this letter, it would be found abundantly in the enumeration of such natural particulars as these, concerning the various dispositions of a large multitude of professed Christians. Pliny says that under solemn oath the Christians affirmed, that their whole crime or error lay in their meeting upon the Lord's day, before it was light, for the sake of being quiet and unmolested, when they sung and prayed in the name of Christ, and bound themselves not in any pledge of wickedness, but under a sacred agreement to abstain from the sins prevailing around them. This representation is precisely in accordance with the idea of a Christian assembly, which Pliny would have been likely to form from what he could hear. He adds that after this service they separated — and after a time came together again to a common meal; but that since the publication of his edict they had given up this latter meeting. He refers, not to the observance of the Lord's Supper, which generally accompanied the morning service, but to a common friendly meeting of the rich and poor, called a Love Feast, which was in general prevalence among the early Christians, and highly advantageous to their sympathy and mutual affection. This feast, however, was not enjoined in the New Testament, and by omitting it, when it was prohibited, the Christians, as they were bound to do, showed a

proper respect for the civil authority of the magistrate, and took some other method of providing for the poor and destitute. The great jealousy then entertained, of any assembly of the people, is proved to us by another letter of Pliny to the Emperor, with his answer. A destructive conflagration had occurred in Bithynia, and Pliny asked permission to establish a company of one hundred and fifty firemen; but the Emperor refused, on the plea that they would not fail to form themselves into assemblies. The Christians then gave up their social feasts. But Pliny was not satisfied with simple judicial evidence; he put two aged deaconesses to the torture; yet even then he discovered nothing, except a devoted adherence to their belief, which he calls a bad and excessive superstition, deeming it alike absurd and immoderate. He admits the great numbers of the converts, of both sexes, of every age and rank, in city, village, and open country; yet his success in working upon the timid, and the unstable, leads him to hope he can fully extirpate the faith. Though the temple and sacrificial rites had been greatly neglected, and but few victims had of late been sold in the public shambles, he catches at the appearance of a return to former usages. There is in these statements evidence, that popular feelings were enlisted both for and against the Christian faith. Pliny himself was a priest; and he writes to the Emperor who was likewise the high priest of the empire. Both were concerned for the Pagan worship.

Have we not reason to feel proud of the high and honorable testimonies to our religion, thus unwittingly given by a learned heathen? We should cherish with gratitude and reverence the resolute constancy, the guiltless perseverance of that community of early Eastern Christians. See 1 Peter, i. 1, and iv. 12, &c.

A few remarks may likewise be added upon the answer, which the Emperor Trajan returned to Pliny. He uses few words, but is distinct and lawyer-like. He approves the proceedings of his official agent, instituted in the deficiency of any legal precedents, and thus shows his own opinion, that Christianity was only a temporary effervescence. He admits that there should be a difference in the treatment of women, children, and responsible men. He allows forgiveness upon good proof of repentance. He decides that the name alone, without any crime attached to it, is to be punished. He forbids their being sought after, or apprehended by anonymous accusation. Those who acknowledge having been Christians, and are willing to

recant, are to show their sincerity by supplicating the heathen gods. This imperial edict, though addressed particularly to Pliny, of course indicated the mode of proceeding against the Christians, which all provincial officers were to adopt. There is no proof that Trajan ever revoked it. It was inhuman and cruel, and all we can say in its favor is, that it might have been more severe. These Letters exhibit to us the first effects of Christianity, apparent to those who were not its disciples; its secret and mysterious meetings, its prayers and sacraments in the name of an unknown deity, drawing its disciples away from the sacred rites and the public spectacles of heathenism. There was a remarkable desertion of the temples, and of the market for bestial victims. Large multitudes of every age and rank, even some Roman citizens, professed the religion — even retired hamlets, and isolated country dwellings contained its disciples. They had long professed their faith, and no threat or punishment would lead them to revile a man, who they knew had suffered an ignominious death, after a lowly birth and life. Why had they this intensity of faith, save that they knew in whom they believed? Their faith was very simple, free from abstruse speculations, and within the capacity of all sorts of men. Above all their innocence is attested. No crime could be charged upon them; even deserters and traitors could not implicate them. Their name, as it brought them to suspicion, served for their condemnation. It is likewise interesting to observe the haughty indifference of Pliny to the Christian faith. He cared no more about it than to observe the forms of law against its disciples. He speaks of them and of their superstition, as we might suppose he would do, when compelled to turn aside, for a moment, from the usual tenor of his correspondence with the elegant and refined companions of his city life.

In concluding our remarks upon these heathen testimonies, we will only add, that they are full and abundant specimens of what we should have, if we were in possession of a large library of works from that age. Were there an hundred more such testimonies, they would only offer a more extended commentary upon the expression of the apostle, that the doctrine of Jesus Christ was to the Gentiles — *foolishness*.

G. E. E.

TERTULLIAN'S TRACT ON THE TRINITY.

THE substance of this article will consist of a translation from the treatise of Tertullian against Praxeas, on the Trinity. We offer it, in some sort a mere curiosity, as being the most ancient Trinitarian Tract now extant. As a mere curiosity, perhaps, it would not be worth the trouble of translation, nor worthy of a place in so grave a journal as this. But it may answer other and higher purposes, than to be shown as a literary antique. It is a specimen of the theological composition of the early church, and of the modes of reasoning which were then thought legitimate. It shows how much knowledge of the fountains of theological knowledge it was then thought necessary to possess, in order to settle points of faith.

The works of Tertullian, it appears to us, merit more attention than has usually been given to them by scholars. They have usually been mainly searched for arguments to sustain one side or the other of the various controversies, which have sprung up in the church. Their true value, it seems to us, is rather ethical than theological. They show us the effect which Christianity had then produced, in modifying the moral sentiments of the Roman world. What they were under the sway of Paganism we learn through the classics. In the works of Virgil and Horace, Cicero and Tacitus, we learn very nearly what was the standard of right and wrong, what constituted a good and what a bad man. In the works of Tertullian, the classical scholar first finds the language of the stern conquerors of the world used to express the new moral and religious ideas introduced by Christianity. He finds the Latin language greatly degenerated from its classic purity, new words introduced, and old ones used in new senses. He is more sensible than ever of its inferiority to the Greek, in richness, flexibility, and precision. It appears clumsy and awkward, when set to the task of nice definition. Its fingers are found to be all thumbs, when he attempts to pick up with them the minute points of ethical and theological controversy.

From the writings of Tertullian alone, almost a perfect system might be made out of the ethics of Christianity, at that period. We see, indeed, in him, that the sternness of the Roman temper assimilated most readily with the ascetic features

of Christianity, and the readiness, with which he fell in with the Montanist doctrines and discipline, was more likely to have been caused by the bent of his disposition, than any disappointment of his ambition, as is sometimes asserted, in not obtaining the See of Carthage or Rome.

Tertullian was a native of Carthage, and flourished in the latter part of the second, and the beginning of the third century. He was a man of strong native powers of mind, and had received that measure of early education which was bestowed upon the middle classes of Roman society. At what time he was converted, we are not informed. He became a voluminous writer at an early age. And if we were to judge from what is now extant, as well as what has perished, we cannot conceive how he could have done much else than write and publish. He had a reputation for orthodoxy, until past the middle age, when he became acquainted with the pretensions of Montanus, an enthusiast of Asia Minor, who with his two companions, Priscilla and Maximilla, professed to have the gift of prophecy, and preached various uncommanded austerities as indispensable to salvation. This alienated him from the body of the church, and he afterwards spoke of his old associates in terms of contempt, calling them Naturalists, meaning by it, sensualists.

Most of his writings are ethical in their character. But he was always ready for a controversy, and when engaged in one, he never spared his adversary, but heaped upon him, as the reader will see, in the following translation, every species of abuse. To attribute his actions to the devil, to say that he is suborned by the devil to lie, and to hint that it would have been well if God had annihilated him, is with our author very moderate language. Who this Praxeas was, against whom Tertullian composed this treatise, we have scarce any means of knowing. What we do know about him is chiefly gathered from this very composition. Other ecclesiastical writers say, that he was a native of Africa. What had raised the ire of Tertullian against him, seems to have been his conduct concerning Montanus and his associates. It appears that the Bishop of Rome had become, to some extent, persuaded of the reality of the pretensions of Montanus, and was about to write letters to the churches of Asia Minor, to effect a reconciliation between them and Montanus, with whom they had been at variance. Praxeas, it would seem, made the Bishop acquainted with the true nature of this new prophecy, and was the

cause of his recalling his letters of recognition. Before this he seems to have come to Africa, and to have had a controversy with Tertullian, been vanquished, and recanted. Tertullian was careful to make him sign a written renunciation of his errors, and he says that he left the document among the orthodox, when he forsook the church. The style of this part of the Tract is so exceedingly obscure, that it is difficult to know precisely what he means to intimate; for he scarcely does any thing more than intimate what took place. Afterwards, it would seem, that he relapsed, and again began to propagate his doctrines, much to the annoyance of his old antagonist, who threatens that by this last attack he means utterly to annihilate him.

Praxeas was a Unitarian; as *Tertullian candidly confesses the majority of the church were at that time*. It was only the philosophical and the learned, that adopted the *economy*, as they called the distinction of the Godhead into three persons, Father, Son, and Spirit. The common people looked upon it with horror, as the introduction of polytheism into the church, and as no better than the many gods of the heathen. The views of Praxeas, as far as they can be gathered from the writings of his opponent, were similar to those of Sabellius, which were promulgated about fifty years after. Neither Praxeas, nor Sabellius, nor any of the ancient Unitarians, denied that there was something divine in Christ; but they maintained that it was not a person, distinct from the one God. Their adversaries, thinking this divine something to be an essential part of the person of Christ, imagined that they sufficiently condemned this hypothesis by showing, that it necessarily involved the supposition, that the Father suffered. Its advocates, therefore, were summarily condemned by one word of contempt and reproach, and called Patripassians.

This very fact, if it is carefully considered, betrays a wide discrepancy between the ancient and the modern theory of the trinity. In the present condition of the human mind, no theory of the trinity can be tolerated for a moment, which does not make the three persons equal, "equal in power and glory." If it were a derogation from the glory of the First Person to have suffered, it was no less so for the Second. Indeed, in modern times, all ideas of the Deity's suffering seem to have been abandoned. According to the conceptions of the ancients,

the Second Person might suffer, but the First could not. They were not then of "equal glory."

In the ancient trinity, the Son was a *derived* being; and though he had always existed in the Father as his reason, still as Son, his existence was comparatively of modern date. We now proceed to the Tract.

TERTULLIAN AGAINST PRAXEAS.

In various ways the devil has attempted to counterfeit the truth. Sometimes he has aimed to shake it by defending it. He vindicates the unity of God, that out of that unity he may make a heresy. He says, that the Father himself descended into a virgin, that he was born of her, that he suffered, and, in short, that he was Jesus Christ. The Serpent must have made a mistake then, in the temptation of Jesus, after the baptism of John, when he approached him as the Son of God, although he was sure that God had a Son, from those very scriptures which he used to tempt him. "If thou be the Son of God, command these stones, that they be made bread." Also, "If thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down, for he hath given his angels charge concerning thee, that in their hands they should bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone." Would he accuse the gospels of falsehood, and say, "Let Matthew and Luke look to the truth of their accounts?" Will he boast, as he might in that case, "I approached God himself; I tempted the Omnipotent, face to face?" Or, "If he were merely the Son of God, I should not have deigned to tempt him?" But the devil was a liar from the beginning, and is ready to suborn a man for his purpose, if he can meet such a man as Praxeas.

It was he, who was the first to introduce this species of false doctrine into Rome. He was a man always restless, and inflated with the boast of martyrdom, merely from the fact of having suffered the vexation of a short imprisonment. And if he had given his body to be burned, it would have profited him nothing, because he was destitute of the love of God, and has done every thing he could to destroy his gifts. For when the Bishop of Rome was about to recognise the prophetic character of Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla, and by their recognition to give peace to the churches of Asia, it was he, who

by asserting falsehoods concerning these prophets and their churches, and taking the part of their opponents, compelled him to recall his letters, already sent out, and recede from the reception of their divine gifts. So Praxeas accomplished two works of the devil at the same time, — he expelled prophecy, and introduced heresy, he put to flight the Comforter, and crucified the Father. The Praxeian tares spread far and near. Here also they were sown; while many, unsuspecting of evil, slept in the simplicity of their own doctrines. Then they seemed to be transformed to something better, by an instrument whom God chose. They even appeared to be thoroughly rooted out. The teacher, who converted him, thought to take security for his better behavior in future, and his written recantation now remains among the Naturalists, (sensualists) in whose communion the controversy was held. For a while he was silent. Soon after, we ourselves were separated from the Naturalists, by our recognition and defence of the Comforter. But it was found, that those tares were not dead. They had only cast their seed. For a while, through hypocrisy, they maintained a secret life, and at length broke out afresh. But with God's leave, by this attempt, they shall be completely eradicated. But, if I fail, I have the satisfaction of knowing, that the day is coming, when all adulterated fruits, together with all things that offend, shall be burnt up in unquenchable fire:

So it is preached, that after the commencement of time, the Father was born, and the Father suffered; that Jesus Christ is God himself, the Lord Omnipotent. But we have always, and now especially, since we were more fully instructed by the Comforter, who leadeth into all truth, believed in one, only God, but with this modification, which we call the economy, that this one God has a Son, his Word, who proceeded from him, through whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made: he was sent by the Father into a virgin, and born of her, man and God, son of man and Son of God, and called Jesus Christ: that he suffered, died, was buried, according to the Scriptures, that he was raised up by the Father, and taken again into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father, and will come to judge the quick and dead, and thence he sent, according to his promise, from the Father, the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, the Sanctifier of the faith of those, who believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. That this rule of faith has come down from the beginning, and dates

before various other heresies, not to mention this of Praxeas, who is of yesterday, is proved, as well by the modern date of all heretics, as the newness of this Praxeian heresy. On this ground, there is a presumption against all heresies, that what is oldest is truest, and that which is most modern is most likely to be corrupted. While we retain the advantage of this prescription, that some who need information may be instructed and guarded, it is proper that we discuss the matter at large, that no perversion might seem to be condemned without a hearing; and especially this, which supposes itself to possess the pure truth, while it thinks that the one God is to be held in no other way, than that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one and the same; as if they are not also all one, provided all are of one, by unity of substance; and thus the sacred truth of the economy is preserved, which disposes the unity in a trinity, dividing them in three, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; three, not in condition, but in order; not in substance, but in form; not in power, but in appearance; but of one substance, of one condition, of one power; for it is one God, from whom these orders and forms and appearances are put forth. But how they can be capable of number without division, this treatise will show as we proceed.

For all the simple, I will not say, the unthinking and the unlettered, which are always a majority of believers, since the rule of faith itself turns them from the many gods of this world to the one only true God,—not understanding that the unity is to be believed under certain conditions of its own,—are horror-struck at the economy. They take for granted that the number and order of the trinity is a division of the unity; although a unity, deriving a trinity from itself, is not destroyed by it, but maintained. So they boast, that two or three are preached by us, but they assume to be the worshippers of one God, as if unity unreasonably established would not make a heresy, and a trinity reasonably explained would not constitute truth. “We hold,” say they, “the Monarchy.” And so the Latins, and those of the lowest rank, lay stress upon the very word, insomuch that you would suppose that they understood the Monarchy as well as they know how to pronounce the word. While the Latins zealously cry out, “Monarchy,” even the Greeks are unwilling to understand the economy. But I, if I have acquired any skill in each of these languages, understand monarchy to mean nothing else than one undivided dominion; nor do I conceive

that the condition of a monarchy should necessarily be, that he, whose it is, should not have a son, or have made a son for himself, or should not administer his monarchy through those whom he chooses. And I affirm, that there is no government, so exclusively of one, so undivided, so much a monarchy, as not to be administered by other persons next in rank, whom he has provided as his officials. And if he, to whom the monarchy belongs, has a son, it is not immediately divided, does not cease to be a monarchy, if the son is taken to participate in it; but it still continues to belong chiefly to him, by whom it is communicated to the son, and while it is his, it is as much a monarchy as ever, since it is held by two so united.

If, therefore, the Divine Monarchy is administered by so many legions and armies of angels, as it is written;—"A thousand thousand stood before him, and a thousand times a hundred thousand were in his presence," and does not therefore cease to be of one, so as to be monarchy no longer, because it is governed by so many thousand powers, why should God appear to suffer division and dispersion in the Son and Spirit, who have obtained the second and third places, sharing as they do the substance of the Father,—a division and dispersion of which is not suffered in such a multitude of angels, unlike in substance to God. You consider the parts, the evidences, the instruments, the power, and every thing that belongs to a monarchy, to be the destruction of it, but not with justice. It would be far better for you to regard the meaning of the thing, rather than the sound of a word. You ought rather to consider that to be the destruction of a monarchy, when another, of the same condition and dignity, and therefore the rival of the monarch, is brought in, when another God is introduced against the Creator. Then, such an evil result would follow, when many were introduced, as the Valentinians and Prodicians represent; then, there is an overthrow of the monarchy, when the Creator is destroyed. But, how can I in fact destroy the monarchy, when I deduce the Son from no other source, but the substance of the Father, doing nothing without the will of the Father, deriving all his power from the Father; when I preserve the monarchy in the Son, which was delivered to him by the Father? I may say the same of the third in gradation, since I do not derive the Spirit from any other source, than the Father through the Son. Beware rather, that you do not yourself destroy the monarchy, in denying the

distribution and dispensation of it, under as many names, as it has pleased God to ordain. It remains so completely in its proper condition as a monarchy, although the trinity is introduced, that it must be restored to the Father by the Son; as the Apostle writes of the final consummation of all things, "when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father," according to the second Psalm, "sit at my right hand, till I make thy enemies thy footstool." "And when all things shall be subjected to him, with the exception of him who subjected all things to him, then shall he be subjected to him, who did put all things under him, that God may be all in all." We see then, that the Son is no hindrance to the monarchy, although it is at present in the hands of the Son, because it is in its entire integrity with the Son, and in its entire integrity will be restored by the Son to the Father. So that no one destroys the monarchy by the fact, that he admits a Son, to whom it is confessed that it is delivered by the Father, and from whom it is again to be restored to the Father. By this one quotation from the Apostolic Epistle, we are able to prove that the Father and the Son are two, not only from the names, Father and Son, but from the necessity there is, that he who delivers, and he who receives, he who is subjected, and he to whom he is subjected, should be two.

But since they maintain, that the two are one, so that the Father and the Son are the same, it is proper that we examine the whole matter of the Son at length, whether he is, who he is, and how he exists; and so the thing will develop itself from the Scriptures and their interpretation. It is said, that Genesis, in Hebrew, begins thus, "In the beginning, God made to himself a Son." But as this is not certain, I shall draw my arguments from the very condition of God, in which he existed before the creation of the world, till the generation of the Son. Before all things God was alone, and was to himself his own world, and place, and all things; alone, because there was nothing external to him; but not alone, because he had with him, what he had in him, his own reason, for God is a reasonable Being, and reason was in him first, and so all things are from him. This reason is his intellect. The Greeks call it *Logos*; which term is also applied to speech. So the Latins are accustomed to say, by the most literal translation, "In the beginning, speech was with God," whereas reason might be considered more ancient, for God was not a speaking Being

from the beginning, but a rational Being before the beginning ; and as speech itself is made up of reason, so it shows that reason must have existed before, as its substance. But this, if so, makes no difference. For although God had not yet sent forth his speech, he still had it just as much in himself, with and in reason itself, in silently meditating, and arranging with himself those things which he was about to utter by speech. For when thinking and arranging with his reason, he made that to be speech, which he afterwards uttered by speech. That you may now easily understand from yourself how this happens, consider, in the first place, how you, who are a rational animal, have reason in yourself, since you were not only made by a rational Creator, but are animated by his very substance. Consider, that when you hold converse with yourself, this is done with reason within you, that answering to you with words to every motion of thought, and every act of intellect. Whatever you think, is speech, and whatever you understand, is reason. You cannot think without words ; and when you speak, you suffer speech to converse with you ; in which speech, resides this very reason, by means of which you think when you talk with speech, and by means of which you speak when you think. So that speech is often, in some sort, a second person in you, through whom you speak when you think, and by means of whom you think when you speak. Speech itself is another person. How much more perfectly does this take place in God, whose image and likeness you bear, that he should have in himself reason, even without words, and speech in thought. It may be then, that I have not rashly presumed that God was not alone before the creation of the universe, since he always had in himself reason, and in reason, speech, which he made second from himself, by meditating within himself. This power and arrangement of the divine understanding is exhibited in the Scriptures under the name of Sophia, Wisdom. For what is wiser than the reason or speech of God ? Therefore we hear Wisdom speaking, as if created a second person. "The Lord created me in the beginning of his ways, for his works. Before he made the earth, before the mountains were placed, and before all the hills, he begat me ;" that is, forming and generating me in his own mind. Then consider how she stood by him, by a real separation. "When he prepared the heavens," says she, "I was there, and when he made the mighty clouds, which ride upon the winds ; when he made

fast the fountains, which are under the heaven, I was with him, confirming his work. I was she in whom he delighted, and each day he found pleasure in my person." For as soon as God determined to bring forth, in their substances and forms, those things which he had contrived by the reason and speech of wisdom, he first produced the Word, having in himself his own appropriate attributes, reason and wisdom; so all things were created by him, through whom all things were thought out and contrived, and made even, so far as they were already in the mind of God. For this alone was wanting to them, that they should come forth in their substances and forms, so as to be subjects of sense and perception. Then it was, therefore, that the Word himself assumed his form and beauty, sound and voice, when God said, "Let there be light." This is the perfect nativity of the Word, when he proceeded from God, having been formed in thought by him under the name of Wisdom: "The Lord created me, the beginning of his ways;" then born in reality; "When he prepared the heavens, I was there." Then he made him equal with himself, inasmuch as he was made his Son, by proceeding from him, first begotten before all things, and only begotten, inasmuch as he alone is begotten of God, alone coming forth from the womb of his heart, according to what the Father himself testifies: "My heart is producing a good Word." Then the Father, rejoicing in his person, addresses him who was equally delighted: "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," and, "before the morning star, I begat thee." So the Son, on his part, owns his Father, in the name of Wisdom: "The Lord created me, in the beginning of his ways, for his works. Before all the hills he begat me." For if here Wisdom seems to say, that she was created by God for his works and ways, and in another place it is asserted, that "all things were made by the Word, and without him was nothing made that was made," as also again, "By the Word of the Lord, were the heavens established, and all their hosts by his breath," that is by the breath that was in the word — it appears that it was one and the same power, now under the name of Wisdom, and now under the appellation Word, which received the beginning of its ways for the works of God, which established the heavens, through which all things were made, and without which nothing was made. It is not necessary any further to argue the point, that the same thing is meant

under the name of Wisdom and Reason, and under every name of the divine mind and understanding, that was made the Son of God, and which was generated, by proceeding from him.

"You concede therefore," you answer, "that the Word is a substance, in some sort, formed by breath and the communication of intelligence"? Certainly. But, on your part, you are unwilling to have him possess a substantial existence, with the attributes of a substance, so as to appear to be a real thing, and a real person, and thus constituted to be a second from God, making two, Father and Son, God and the Word. "For what is a word," you say, "but a voice, and a sound of the mouth, and as the grammarians express it, a repercussion of air, intelligible to the ear, but beyond this, something, I know not what, empty, bodiless, and immaterial?" But I affirm, that nothing can proceed from God empty and immaterial, since it is produced by something which is not empty and immaterial; nor can that want substance, which proceeds from so great a substance, and produces such great substances, for he made all things, which were made through him. For how can he be nothing, without whom nothing was made? so that what was itself without substance, created what was solid, and what was empty, made what was full, and that, which was incorporeal, made what was corporeal? For although one thing may create another that is different from itself, nothing can be created by that which is without substance and reality. Is the Word of God an empty and unsubstantial thing, which is called the Son of God, and even called God himself: "And the word was with God, and the word was God"? It is written, "Thou shalt not take the name of God upon a thing of naught." He certainly has a real existence, who was made "in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God." In the form of God, in what sense? In some sense surely, and not in no sense. For who will deny that God is material, although he is a spirit? For spirit is a sort of matter, of its own kind, and in its own form. For those things which are invisible, whatever they may be, have, with God, their body and form, by which they are visible to God alone; how much more should that not be without substance, which was sent forth from his own substance. Whatever then was the substance of the Word, I affirm him to be a person, I claim for him the name of

Son, and while I acknowledge him as a Son, I maintain that he is second from the Father. If by this any one imagines that I am introducing a sort of production, that is the derivation of one thing from another, as Valentinus does, producing one Eon from another — in the first place, I will say to you, that the truth does not use this word, and its meaning and signification, because heresy uses it likewise; but heresy has rather borrowed it from the truth, that it might use it for the purpose of its own imposture. “Was the Word of God produced or not?” Here, pause with me a moment. If he was produced, observe that it is such a production as truth allows, and let heresy see in what she has counterfeited the truth. Let us now see in what sense each party applies the thing, and its name. Valentinus divides and separates his productions from the author, and places them so far from him, that the Eon does not know its father; so far, that he desires to know him, and is not able; yes, and is almost swallowed up and lost in the rest of the universe. But with us, the Son alone knows the Father, and has himself laid open the Father’s bosom, and has heard and seen all things with the Father, and only speaks those things which he is commanded of the Father. Nor does he do his own will, but that of the Father, which he knew already, nay, had known from the beginning. “For who knoweth the things which are in God, but the Spirit which is in him.” But a word is made of spirit, (or breath.) Speech is made of breath; and as I may say, breath, or spirit, is the body of a word. The Word, therefore, is always in the Father, as he says, “I am in the Father.” And he is always with the Father, as it is written: “And the word was with God.” And he is never separated from the Father, or is another from the Father, because, “I and the Father are one.” This is the production which is according to truth, which preserves the unity, by which we say that the Son was produced from the Father, but not separated from him. For God produced the Word, as the Comforter teaches, in the same manner that the root produces the shrub, the fountain the stream, the sun the sun-beam, because every thing that originates is a parent, every thing which springs from an origin is an offspring; much more the Word of God, which also properly takes the name of Son. Notwithstanding, the shrub is not divided from the root, nor the stream from the fountain, nor the sun from the sun-beam, so

neither is the Word from God. Therefore, after the manner of these examples, I profess to say, that God and his Word are two, the Father and his Son. For the root and the shrub are two things, but joined together. And the fountain and stream are two in appearance, but not divided. The sun and sun-beam are two forms, but still cohere. Every thing, which proceeds from any thing else, is second to the thing from which it proceeds, but is not therefore separated from it. But where there is a second, there are two; where there is a third, there are three. So the Spirit is third from God and his Son, as the fruit is third from the root through the stem, the river is third from the fountain through the stream, and the ray third from the sun through the beam. It is in nothing alienated from its source, from which it derives its attributes. So the Trinity, passing down from the Father through the connected and interwoven grades, is not inconsistent with the monarchy, and maintains the economy. This rule of faith you may consider me every where to maintain, that the Father, Son, and Spirit are not separated from each other; and observe under what conditions this is spoken. For note, that I say, that the Father is different, the Son different, and the Spirit different. But a simple, or perverse person, would understand this amiss, if he should so interpret this diversity as to mean separation of the Father, Son, and Spirit. But I say this from necessity — because they contend that the Father, Son, and Spirit are the same, glorifying the monarchy against the economy — not that the Son is another from the Father by diversity, but by distribution; not another by division, but by distinction; for the Father cannot be precisely the same with the Son, without some little difference. For the Father is the whole substance, but the Son is a derivation from the whole, and a portion of it, as he professes: “My Father is greater than I.” That the Son is made less, is sung in the Psalm: “A little lower than the angels.” And so the Father is different from the Son, in that he is greater, inasmuch as he who begets must be different from him who is begotten, he that sends from him who is sent, he who does any thing from the agent through whom it is done.

It may be seen, that when our Lord uses this word in the person of the Comforter, he does not mean a division, but only an order. “For I will pray the Father,” says he, “and he shall send you another Comforter, the Spirit of truth.” So he shows himself to be another from the Comforter, as he has shown that

the Son is another from the Father. As he has shown that the Comforter is third in rank, so have we shown that the Son is second, that the economy may be preserved. Is it not clear, that one is different from the other, from the fact, that they are called Father and Son? All things are what they are called, and are called what they are; for the names of things ought not to be confounded with each other, any more than the things of which they are the names. What is, is, and what is not, is not, and "whatsoever is more than this cometh of evil." Each must be either the Son or the Father. Night and day cannot be the same, neither can the same be Father and Son, so that both are one and each is other, as these most foolish Monarchians would have it. For they say, that the Father made himself to be his own Son. Having a Son, makes the Father to be a Father, and having a Father, makes the Son to be a Son. Those, who are made what they are by each other, cannot be what they are by themselves, so that a father cannot make himself to be a son to himself, neither can a son make himself to be a son to himself. What God constitutes, that he also preserves. It is necessary that the Father should have a Son, that he may be a Father. So it is necessary that the Son should have a Father, that he may be a son. It is one thing to have, and another thing to be. For instance, in order to be a husband I must have a wife. I cannot be a wife to myself. So also, that I may be a father, I must have a son; I cannot be son to myself; so, that I may be a son, I must have a father; I cannot be a father to myself. I am made to be this and that, by what I have; I must be a father if I have a son, a son if I have a father. On the other hand, I cannot be any of the things which I possess. I cannot have a father and be that father, nor a son and be that son. In as far as it is necessary for me to have one of two things, in order to be the other, in so far it is impossible for me to be both, and at the same time, to be one and have the other. For if I am both son and father, I cannot have that son as a son, because I am that son myself. And if I have not a son, and am the son myself, how can I be the father? For I must have a son, that I may be a father; I am not a son, because I have not a father to make me a son. So, if I am both father and son, I cannot have a father, because I am that father. And if I have not a father because I am that father, how can I be son? for I must have a father in order to be a son; I cannot be a father, if I

have no son to make me a father. This is all a contrivance of the devil, to make one exclude the other; for by reducing both into one, in order to favor the monarchy, it makes God neither the one nor the other. For certainly, there can be no father unless he has a son, and there can be no son unless he has a father. In that case, if there is a father, there is a son. Such a monarchy do they establish, who allow neither Father nor Son!

But they say, that "nothing is impossible with God." Who does not know this; and who is ignorant that "those things which are impossible with men are possible with God? And the foolish things of the world God hath chosen, that they may confound the wise." We have read all this. Therefore, they say, it was not difficult for God to make himself to be both Father and Son, opposite as it may seem to the conditions of human things; as likewise it is contrary to nature for the barren to bring forth, but it was not difficult with God, neither was it for a virgin. Nothing is impossible with God, it is admitted. But if we are allowed to make such rash use of this truth in our assumptions, we may imagine any thing we please concerning God; we may say, that he has done what he might have done. It is not to be believed, because he could do all things, that he has done what he has not done. We must inquire what he has done in fact. He might, I should be safe in affirming, have furnished man with wings for flying, which he has done to the moths; but it does not follow, because he might have done it, that he has done it. He might have annihilated Praxeas and all heretics with him at once; but he did not annihilate them because he could do it. It was proper that there should be both moths and heretics; it was proper, likewise, that the Father should be crucified! But upon this ground, there must be something impossible to God, namely, that which he has not done; not because he could not, but because he would not. For with God it is the same thing to have the power and have the will, the same thing not to have the power and not to have the will; and whatever he has had the will to do, that he has had the power to do, and that he has done; therefore, if he has willed to make himself to be his own Son, he might have done it, and if he could have done it, he has done it. So that you will prove him both to have had the will and the power, if you prove he has actually done it. But you must prove this as explicitly from the Scriptures, as we prove him to have made his Word his Son. He

calls him Son. This Son can be no other than he who proceeds from him. The Word, therefore, who proceeds from him, must be the Son, and not he from whom it proceeds; for he does not proceed from himself. But if you make the Father and the Son the same, you will make the same God to have produced himself, and to have been produced by himself. If he could have done this, it does not follow that he has done it. All I ask is, that you should produce the proof which I demand, like my own; that is, that the Scriptures declare that the Father and the Son are the same, as explicitly as we have made them prove that the Father and Son are distinct from each other; distinct I say, not divided, as I have shown by what is said by God; "My heart is throwing out a good Word;" you must in like manner show, that God has somewhere else said, "My heart is throwing out myself a good Word," so as to show that he who throws out, and that which he throws, are the same, and he who produces is the same with him who is produced, if the same thing is both the Word and God. I will moreover, produce a passage in which the Father says to the Son, "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." If you wish me to believe that the same Being is both Father and Son, show me the place where it is announced, "The Lord said unto himself, I am my own Son; this day have I begotten myself." In like manner is it said, "Before the morning star I begat myself," and "I, the Lord, have begotten myself, the beginning of my ways, for my works; Before all the hills I begat myself;" and other similar passages? Whom could the Lord God have feared, that he dare not declare this, if it were true? Could he have feared that he should not be believed, if he had plainly affirmed that he was both Father and Son? One thing he did fear, and that was to affirm the thing that was not true; he feared himself, and his own truth. I know that he could not declare the thing otherwise than he had ordained it, nor have ordained it otherwise than as he declared it. You make him out to be false, an equivocator and a deceiver in this article of belief, if while he was his own Son, he attributed the personality of the Son to another, since all the Scriptures both affirm a trinity and maintain a distinction. From these Scriptures our argument is deduced, that it is impossible for the same person to be made to appear to be speaking, to be spoken to, and to be spoken of; for we cannot suppose such perversity and deception in God, that while he is

really addressing himself, he should seem to be addressing another. Consider other addresses of the Father to the Son in Isaiah, "Behold my Son, whom I have chosen, my beloved, in whom I am well pleased. I will put my Spirit upon him, and he shall proclaim judgment to the nations." Consider that he addresses to him again, "It is a great thing to thee, that thou art called my Son, to establish the tribes of Jacob, and to turn back the captivity of Israel. I have set thee for a light of the nations, that thou mightest be salvation to the ends of the earth." Now, consider what the Son says concerning the Father. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach glad tidings to men." Likewise what he says to the Father, on the same subject, in one of the Psalms; "Thou wilt not forsake me, until I proclaim thy name to the whole generation to come." Also, in another Psalm; "Lord, how are they multiplied who oppress me." Indeed, almost all the Psalms speak in the person of Christ; that is to say, they represent the Son speaking to the Father, that is, Christ addressing God. Observe how the Spirit speaks in the third person of the Father and the Son. "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, till I make thy enemies thy footstool." Also, in Isaiah, "Thus saith the Lord to my Lord, Christ." Also, by the same prophet, to the Father concerning the Son; "Lord who hath believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? We have declared concerning him; As a little child, as a root out of a dry ground, he had neither beauty nor comeliness." These are a few examples out of many. For we do not pretend to turn over the whole Scriptures, though we might, by appealing to the full majesty and authority of each chapter, enrich our treatise with a greater mass of evidence. But by these few, the distinction of the trinity is plainly exhibited. It is the Spirit that speaks, it is the Father to whom he speaks, and it is the Son of whom he speaks. The same holds good with other things, which are now spoken to the Father concerning the Son, or to the Son; and now to the Son, concerning the Father, or to the Father; and now to the Spirit, — they establish the separate individuality of each person.

If you are still scandalized by the number of the trinity, as if it were not connected in simple unity, I ask how one indivisible Being can speak in the plural number; "Let us make man in our image, and in our likeness;" when he should rather

have said ; " Let me make man in my image and in my likeness," if he were a single, indivisible Being. So, in what follows ; " Behold Adam has become like one of us," he deceives or sports with us, if while he is one, single, indivisible Being, he speaks in the plural number.

Or, perhaps, you will say, that he spoke to the angels, as the Jews interpret it, who also do not acknowledge the Son. Or, perhaps you will say, it was because he was himself Father, Son, and Spirit, that he exhibited himself as plural, and spoke to himself in the plural number. Rather let us say it was because the second person, his Word, adhered to him, and the Spirit in the Word — that he spoke in the plural number, " let us make," " our," and " us." With whom did he make man, and whom did he make him like ? With the Son surely, who was one day to put on humanity ; and with the Spirit, who was to sanctify man ; he talked with them from the unity of the trinity, as assistants and spectators. Finally, the following Scripture distinguishes between the persons, " And God made man ; in the image of God made he him." Why did he not say, " his own image," if he who made man was one, and there were no other in whose image to make him ? But there was one, in whose image he made him, namely the Son, who, being himself about to become a truer and more real man, was the real cause of man's being said to be made in his image, since he was made in the image of the true man. But in the preceding works of creation, how is it written ? In the first place, before the Son appears ; " And God said ; let there be light, and there was light." The Word himself was immediately " the true Light, which enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world." And through him came into existence the material light of the universe.

Then, with the aid and ministry of Christ in the Word, God willed, and God created. " And God said, let there be a firmament, and God made a firmament. And God said, let there be lights, and God made the greater light and the less." But the same person made all, who made the first, that is, the Word of God, " through whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made that was made." Now, if he himself was God, according to John, " The Word was God," you have two Gods, one speaking, and the other doing. But in what manner we are to consider him another, I have already explained,—in regard to person, and not to substance, so as to

be distinguished but not divided. Moreover, although I every where maintain one substance in the three adhering together, still I say, that in order to make sense, he who commands must be one, and he who acts must be another. For he would not have commanded, if he himself were to do what he commands to be done by another. Still he did command, which he would not have done, were he one; or he would have acted without uttering a command, or not waited till he could command himself.

"But," say you, "if a God said and a God did,—if one God said, and another God did, then two Gods are asserted." If you are so obstinate, you are at liberty to think so; and to think it more, since it can be shown, that there are two Gods spoken of in one of the Psalms. "God is thy throne, forever, the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved justice and hated wickedness, therefore God hath anointed thee, even thy God." If he addresses God, and affirms that God is anointed by God, then he proposes two Gods.

Hence also, Isaiah says to Christ: "The Sabeans, men of tall stature, shall pass over to thee, and follow thee with their hands bound, and shall adore thee, because God is in thee. For thou art our God, and we were ignorant of it, the God of Israel." Then too, in saying, God is in thee, and thou art God, he speaks of two, one who was, and another, in whom he was, namely Christ and the Spirit. This very thing you will find in the Gospel, in so many words. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." There was one who was, and another with whom he was. But I read also, the name of Lord applied to two persons, "The Lord said unto my Lord sit at my right hand." Also, Isaiah says, "Lord, who hath believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed." He would have said, "thy arm," instead of the "arm of the Lord," if he had not wished to be understood, the Lord the Father, and the Lord the Son. Genesis is much older testimony, where it says: "And the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah, sulphur and fire from heaven, from the Lord." Either deny these things to be Scripture, or who are you, that you should think that they are not to be received as they are written, especially as they are not expressed in allegories and parables, but in plain and simple definitions. But if you are one of those, who cannot endure the Lord showing himself to be the Son of God, nor believe him to be the Lord, recollect

with these opposers, that it is written, "I have said, Ye are Gods, and Sons of the Most High." And, "God standeth in the congregation of Gods"; and if the Scripture does not hesitate to call them Gods, who became the sons of God by faith, you may know that it has much more properly conferred the name of God on the true and only Son of God. "But," say you, "I shall still urge you on positively to assert even now, from the authority of these very Scriptures, that there are two Gods, and two Lords." By no means. For we, who have, by the grace of God, investigated the dates and purposes of different parts of the Scriptures, being disciples, not of men, but of the Comforter, maintain that there are two, and three also, with the Holy Spirit, according to the scheme of the economy, which makes a numerical distinction, that it may not seem, as you perversely infer, that the Father was born and suffered, which is not lawful to believe, since it is not so taught. We have never uttered such an expression as two Gods and two Lords, not because the Father is not God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, and each one God. But in ancient times, two Gods and two Lords were asserted, to the end, that when Christ should come he should be acknowledged as God and called Lord, because he is the Son of God and of the Lord. Since, if in the Scriptures there had been found but one person of God and of the Lord, Christ would justly have been excluded from the title of God and Lord. For if no one had been declared to be God, but the one God, and the one Lord, it would have appeared that the Father himself descended, since only one God and one Lord was read of, and the plurality of his nature, which was preparing as the substratum of the future faith, would have been veiled. But when Christ appeared, and was known by us, that it was he that made a plurality, being himself made the second from the Father, and the Holy Spirit the third, and now that the Father was through him more fully made known, the name of God and Lord was reduced to one, that the heathen might pass over from the multitude of idols to the one only God, and a difference might be established between the worshippers of one and of many divinities.

It is unnecessary to pursue this translation any further, for the purposes for which it was introduced, to give a specimen of the earliest Trinitarian Tract we have, to obtain a glimpse of

the theology of the second and third centuries, and to weigh in the balances of modern philosophy the arguments, which were then thought sufficient to establish so important a doctrine as the tri-personal nature of God. Let us take a summary view of it as it stands, as far as we have gone.

He begins by accusing Praxeas of being suborned and set on by the devil, of making out that the Bible is false, and the Evangelists liars ; of being a conceited boaster of his sufferings as a martyr ; having introduced into Rome and Carthage the impious heresy, that the Father became incarnate and suffered ; of having been convinced and converted by himself, (Tertullian,) and then of having relapsed and propagated his heresy anew ; of having prevented the recognition, by the Bishop of Rome, of the pretensions of the Montanists.

He then goes on to recite his own creed, to which he attaches particular authority, as he had been instructed by the Comforter. It is, that he believes in one, only God, but under the conditions, which were then called the *economy*, that this one God has a Son, who is his Word ; that he was sent into the virgin, died, rose again, and ascended to heaven, &c. This creed, he says, has the authority of prescription, since it has been handed down by the church from time immemorial. He then goes on to meet the objections, which are brought against this creed, as being inconsistent with the unity of God. He says, the unity is not destroyed, provided one is derived from another, and is of the same substance still, not divided, but existing in continuity, as he afterwards explains it, like the unity of the tree, consisting in roots, trunk, and branches, or of the river, stream, and fountain, or of the sunlight, the sunbeam, and the sun itself. They are each one, though the parts are derived from one another. The economy or trinity does not destroy the unity, but is consistent with it. But the simple and the illiterate, *which are always a majority of believers*, will not hear of the economy, and say that is a return to polytheism. They boast, even the ignorant Latins, that they hold the *monarchy*, which term being Greek, they do not understand. But we, says he, hold the monarchy too. Our trinity is not inconsistent with it, as it affords the instruments of administering it, since the Son and Spirit act in a subordinate capacity. Then follows a long series of texts from Scripture, to prove that God governs the world through the Son ; but the Son must finally deliver up the kingdom to the Father.

But he thinks it proper, since his opponents insist on the unity, and make the Son and the Father to be one, to go into an examination of the whole matter of the Son, in all his relations. He has heard, he says, that Genesis begins in Hebrew "God made for himself a Son." But as this is not certain, he goes on to deduce the history of the Son from the beginning.

In the beginning, God existed alone, and was every thing that existed. Yet he had in himself, for a companion, Reason, with whom he conversed. So God was, in some measure, two in that way. But when he spoke, Reason assumed the form of speech, and became the Word; and through this Word God created every thing. This Word, when so produced, became God's Son. A word is made of breath, and breath in Hebrew, in Greek, and in Latin, is spirit. Here then is God, the Word, and the Spirit in the Word, and they make the trinity.

Such was the orthodox doctrine of the trinity, previous to the Council of Nice. We wish to impress this particularly upon our readers, that it was a doctrine totally different from the modern doctrine of the trinity, which denies all idea of derivation, and justly; as underived and uncaused existence must ever be an attribute of every thing, which challenges the name of God. But, say his opponents, a word is nothing but a reverberation of air, and is nothing in itself. He answers, the Word of God created the world, which is solid and substantial, and as nothing can proceed from nothing, the Word must have been something real and substantial.

He then goes on to establish the identity of the Word of John with the Wisdom spoken of in the book of Proverbs; which he does in the following way. He quotes the twenty-second verse of the eighth chapter, not as it stands in the Hebrew, but in the Septuagint translation; "The Lord created me, the beginning of his ways, for his works;" and makes it to mean, that God created Wisdom the first of all his works, for the purpose of using her as an instrument in creating the rest. In this sense, he thinks, that it harmonizes well with the declaration in the New Testament, that "all things were created by the Word, and without the Word was nothing made." But if this was the meaning of the Greek translators, they utterly mistook the signification of the original, which is correctly given in our common version; "The Lord possessed me in the

beginning of his ways, before his works of old." But Tertullian had probably never seen a Hebrew Bible, and if he had, he could not have read a word in it. But supposing the Septuagint to give the true meaning, he thought this passage precisely in point, to prove, that God first created the Word, and then all things through him.

But here his adversaries are upon him again, and accuse him of making a positive production of one being from another, an idea totally unworthy of God. He defends himself by saying, that the production, which he maintains, is something very different from that of the Valentinians, who asserted the derivation of their Eons from God, in such a sense, as to separate them entirely from him ; so that they did not know who their Father was.

But in his derivation, the Son knows the Father, dwells in the bosom of the Father, reveals the Father, and teaches what the Father bids him. He was with the Father, and was one with the Father ; yet still, in a manner, separate, because he was the Word, and as a word, proceeded from the Father, as a tree from the root, a stream from the fountain, a ray from the sun. He then goes on to quote various passages of Scripture, to prove that they were distinct, but not divided. If they had different names in Scripture, they must be different, for the Scripture never represents falsely.

But then his adversaries turn upon him and say, "that all things are possible with God." He can be Father, Son, and Spirit, himself. No, says Tertullian. God is restrained, not by physical, but by moral impossibilities. He is not himself, Father, Son, and Spirit, because he could not be, but because he did not choose to be. The only way to prove that he has done so, is, not to show that he might have done so, but to prove the fact, that he has done so, from the Scriptures, as satisfactorily as the tri-personality is proved. Then follow several pages of proof texts, from various parts of the Scriptures, of the pertinency and conclusiveness of which every reader must judge for himself.

Such then is the treatise of Tertullian on the trinity. It is a fair, and rather a favorable specimen of the theological speculations of the Fathers of the Church, before the Council of Nice. Such were the arguments by which the doctrine of the trinity was gradually elaborated, which was afterwards established by the formal decree of that Council, and has made a

part of the canon of faith ever since ; nay, is now publicly read and sung in the churches ! We see in this writer, and in all the early Fathers, the want of a knowledge of the Hebrew, and in general of Oriental figures and modes of speech, without which the Old Testament cannot be understood ; nor yet, indeed, the New ; for though the language is Greek, the style of thought and expression is Hebrew. The arguments derived from the Old Testament are generally founded on the Greek translation of the Seventy, and that is often but a poor representation of the original. And it is a singular fact, that the writers of the New Testament have followed the Septuagint in their quotations, and, in some cases, reasoned from the translation instead of the original.

There is in them, too, a palpable want of that general intellectual cultivation and discipline, which are necessary to enable a person to reason conclusively on any subject. This remark is as applicable to the most learned, as the most ignorant. Origen, the most learned of them all, was so deficient in judgment, so incapable of determining what was, or what was not, proved by the facts, which his vast reading brought together, that his conclusions, without sight of his premises, carry very little weight. These traits of the early Fathers confirm the suspicion, we have many other reasons for entertaining, that the Christians, for at least the first three centuries of the existence of the Church, were confined very much to the lower classes, and that it was not considered respectable by the fashionable or the learned world, to become a Christian, before the conversion of Constantine. Not that this was a reproach to the Christians, but the necessary consequence of the state of things which then existed. This circumstance, while it made the religion of the first centuries pure and sincere, made their theology meagre and obscure, not to say puerile and extravagant.

We cannot close these remarks, without adding, that occasional translations from the Fathers would contribute not a little to diffuse among the Christian world a right estimate of those appeals, which they so often see, to the authority of the Fathers, paraded before the reading public, as if they really were entitled to any weight. For instance, in the Oxford controversy, we see page after page almost entirely made up of citations of the opinions and arguments of these ancient writers, as if either the one or the other were of any real force, as opinions and arguments.

There is a use of the Fathers, which is rational and legitimate, as histories of opinions, and a record of the condition and usages of the Church at different periods. In this light they are most interesting. They set before us a vivid picture of the early Church, and the circumstances by which it was surrounded. We learn from them the various opinions which then prevailed, and the reasons which were then thought sufficient for entertaining them. But, as means of learning what Christianity essentially was, they altogether fail us. For this, we must go to the Scriptures themselves, and in our study of them, we get very little light from the Christian writers of the first three centuries.

G. W. B.

A HISTORY.

THOSE deep dark eyes ! full well, too well I know
Their strange sad history, — yet wherefore strange,
Since such the lot of life since years begun, —
And wherefore sad, unless that lot be so,
Which Goodness Infinite is pleased to give,
As preparation for an endless bliss.
Then, not in sadness nor in wonder, we,
May tell that history. Those deep, deep eyes,
Whence all the glorious soul looked nobly out
Of a pure perfect woman — one who came
Right from the hand of God, to be withdrawn
All perfected by deep experience
Of joy and wretchedness :

I saw them first

In happy days long past. The joyous spring
Had just stept forth upon the forest lawn,
Risen from the hidden nook where winter through
She slumbered, down among the withered leaves,
And standing on the fresh young grass, looked round
Trembling and timid. O'er her loosened hair
And flowing robe sprang momentarily fresh buds
Swift opening into flowers, and rich green leaves
Still mingled here and there with withered twigs
And leaves decayed, yet clinging round her form
From her warm winter couch. The air was soft,
For fragrance stole from every glen and hill,
And sunny slope, and woody fountain-side,
And echoes of sweet sound came softly forth,
Tremulous to the ear, — scarce bold enough
Above the faintest whisper to proclaim
The chorus of all liberated things

In earth, and air, and water. Thus all sounds
And sights and scents made perfect harmony,
And she I speak of seemed a part of them.
A child, almost a baby — four kind years
Had stooped in turn to kiss her sunny brow,
And lingered, as if loth to pass her by.
She moved about the cottage where she dwelt
A household angel, — living Joy and Love,
The Spirit of a Smile. She passed along,
And looks long used to sorrow followed her,
And from them she drew answering smiles, as bees
Draw honey from a flower; and her dark eyes
Were full of smiles and tears, each following each
Like clouds and sunshine on an April day.
The flowers loved to kiss her little foot,
The breeze played lovingly about her hair,
The sun looked softly down on her : all felt,
Things animate and lifeless, all alike
Her influence, — all clung to her alike.
The passer-by would pause and look on her,
His hardened brow relax, and even tears
Gush from his eyes, the while he stood and gazed
Upon the exquisite motions of her form,
Or on her face's loveliness, and then
Would pass along, a better, purer man.
If such to casual eyes, how deeply dear
To those of whose whole life she was a part,
The sweetest, holiest part. My memory dwells
Upon her now, and scarce can cease to think
Of all her loveliness. Words cannot say
How exquisite the darling was.

That passed ;
And years went o'er her ere we met again,
For one brief fleeting moment met. The spring
Had passed away, and loose-clad summer reigned

VOL. XXXV. — 3D S. VOL. XVII. NO. II. 23

O'er the parched hill and the shrunk rivulet,
Shrunk, and mourning for its power lost
Of spreading fresh young life around the wood ;
The yellow flowers hung down their heavy heads,
And shrill-toned insects sung from all the trees,
Yet beauty dwelt there still in piny dells,
By the cool river's bank, and in the wood,
Where danced the merry brook from stone to stone,
Thoughtless, unknowing of the sun's hot power ;
And broad green leaves spread a delicious shade,
And moss a soft green seat. In such a spot
I saw her next ; — when merry voices chimed,
And laughter ringing like the waterfall,
Her voice, her laugh, the gayest : then I saw
That lovely child, — a child no longer now,
Changed, yet the same, — and oh how lovely still.
The years still loved her, — as they passed her by,
Each after each had poured into her heart
Treasures of childish happiness, glad life,
Full to o'erflowing, brimmed and running o'er,
Outgushing at those lustrous, sparkling eyes.
You would have thought they ne'er had learned to smile
Until that moment, but were pouring out
A lifetime's happiness at once ; and yet
Year after year aye found her still the same,
Ever as full of joy, as full of love.
And they who saw her most could scarcely rest
For happiness. Pain dwelt not where she came.
Her smile, her beaming eye, her hand's soft touch,
Unsealed the springs of joy in each sad heart,
And they, who came in sorrow, went in peace.
Such was she then. A moment and no more
I gazed on her, and then she passed along —
The sunlight gleamed upon her floating hair, —
She paused a moment, and looked back, her eyes

Gleaming with beauty, like a spirit of joy,
Of joy and love, lit from a rainbow down,
To bless our earth a moment ; — then moved on
A step, and disappeared.

Years passed away
Before we met again : full many a spring
Had deepened into summer ; summer sped,
Swift-footed, into autumn, — when once more
I saw her, for a moment, as she stood
Near by that happy home, where her first years
Of happiness were spent. The autumn brown
Was busy by the roadside and the copse,
Plucking the yellow leaves from bush and tree,
And strewing them around. From out the wood
Echoed the squirrel's chirp, the ripe nut's fall,
Like heavy waterdrops ; the air was clear,
All sights and sounds distinct ; the sun shone warm
Upon the copse's border, where she stood,
Her feet half buried in the withered leaves
Piled deep along the edge. Yes, there she stood
Before me yet once more. Oh God ! how changed
From what I knew her first, — from what she was
When last we met ; and yet how beautiful, —
How nobly, sadly beautiful. No more
The merry childish heart gleamed from her eyes,
The happy home of joy and peace no more.
Those glorious eyes ! No longer in them shone
Sunlight and moonlight mingled. In her heart
Pale sorrow sat, nay, anguish, utter woe.
The certainty of utter sorrow dwelt
Where once was joy's bright seat. That poor, poor heart,
Sorrow itself scarce wished to dwell in it,
But rose and gazed from out those lustrous eyes,
Raising their long-fringed lids — gazing so sad,
So wistfully, so hopelessly, that scarce

You dared to look at them, but felt relief
When, as they most were wont, they drooped again,
And looked no longer so. Oh ! ask me not
The sorrows of her earthly lot. Enough
To know that no slight thing could alter thus
Her, who was once so different ; ask no more,
But weep the bitter tears that then I wept,
Gazing a moment on that lovely one,
Lovely, oh lovely still ; years could not change,
Nor sorrow take away her nobleness,
Her perfect beauty. She was like a cloud,
On summer evening, lingering sad alone,
When all its mates are faded, lingering still,
Above the horizon, looking sadly down
Upon the earth, where late, not all alone,
It dwelt content, — until it fades away,
And never comes again. And did she fade
Like to the cloud ?

She did. More years passed by,
Until at last, when winter, still and cold,
Spread its white mantle on the sleeping earth,
And all was still and motionless as death, —
And yet not dead, but sleeping, — then I saw
For the last time that noble one. She lay
Dying, upon her couch ; life lingered yet
In her enfeebled form, on her pale cheek.
Life could not bear to lose her. But she lay
Yet thinking, feeling, although motionless.
You saw the thought and feeling in her eyes,
Those wondrous eyes ! They failed not, like the rest
Of her departing powers ; but as she drew
Nearer the end, expanded more and more,
Till all her life seemed concentrated there,
All action, thought, and feeling, — and they flamed
Like flaming, dying embers. There she lay ;
She spoke not, moved not. We who stood around

Could scarcely realize that we were ourselves, —
All, at that moment, seemed a part of her.
We hung upon each breath of hers, nor word,
Nor motion, came from us. The moments passed,
But we heard not their footsteps. Till at last
A sudden shudder passed along her frame.
She started up, raising her head at once
From off her pillow, gazed around at us
With such a look, — so strange, and yet so calm,
Unearthly, and yet full of love and faith,
And hope and heavenly beauty, — so made up
Of all we know of earthly loveliness,
And all we dream of angels, — so serene,
So earnest, sure, undoubting, that no change
Of time has dimmed its memory to me,
No other thought of life a moment come
Between it and my mind ; with such a look
She gazed on each of us, — then clasped her hands,
And casting up to Heaven those heavenly eyes,
“ Father, I come,” she said, — and so she died.

Here ends my tale. I said it was not strange ;
If thou still thinkst it so, thou little knowst
Of life and all its changes. And if still
Thou thinkst it sad, oh muse it o’er again,
And think and feel as I do, taught by it
No more to murmur at the ills of life,
To dwell no more upon its happiness,
But see in both their destined end, and look
Beyond its narrow bounds, to that True Life
Where earthly joys and sorrows all are past,
And trouble us no more than yonder bird,
Sitting beneath blue sky and purple cloud,
With snowy wing, regards these scenes below
The clouds and sunshine of our human life.

THE PRESENT TENDENCIES OF THE CHURCH.

A Dissertation read before the Union Ministerial Association.

BRETHREN, in view of the subject, with which your fraternal bidding alone would have given me courage to grapple, you might well address me in the words of the Roman poet:

"Periculosæ plenum opus aleæ
Tractas, et incedis per ignes
Suppositos cineri doloso."

Vast, intangible, formless, featureless is the first aspect of the Church, which, in reverence for its divine Head, and in courtesy to its ill-compacted and jarring members, you thought fit to recognise as one, when you asked me to describe its present tendencies. Did you set me down in mid ocean, in a storm, when neither sun nor stars appeared, and the waves were mountain high, and did you ask me to define the course of the tide, and to mark out the ocean currents, you would have assigned me a task closely analogous to the present. In very truth, my rowers have brought me into deep waters. But there was once enacted, on the deep and angry sea, a majestic drama, which foreshadowed the whole history of the Church, and in which we may, perhaps, be able to designate the point of time at which we stand.

Our Saviour once lay asleep in the hinder part of the ship, when the storm ran high, and the cry arose, "We perish." But his timid fellow voyagers appealed to him for aid in their extremity; and he arose and rebuked the wind, and spread a profound calm over the waves, and the vessel went straight on to her port. Of late, the chaotic elements of the church universal, in their restless striving, in their tumultuous heaving, might well be likened to that inland sea of Galilee, with its eddying currents, and its quick, short swell. The navigators have long been at the point of despair; for their masts are strained, their vessel leaks at every seam, nor know they how near they may be to sunken rocks or engulfing whirlpools. They long ago began to cry for aid; but, not as the disciples did, to the incarnate power and love of Jehovah. Like Jonah's fellow-mariners, they have cried, "every man unto his god," — each to some new device or patent jugglery of his own, each to

some arm of flesh, to some unmeaning symbol, or to some demon or sect, or clan, no less powerless to perform than prompt to promise, no less worthless than specious. Meanwhile, in a ship thus trimmed and manned, Jesus has been of course left "in the hinder part," and there, not at the helm; for there is neither helm nor pilot, — the vessel has been left to drift before every shifting breeze, save when the random plash of a solitary paddle has modified her course for a little season. Jesus has been to the church as one asleep. His empty name has been in their mouths, — his words they have carried as a talisman outside their bosoms, — his ordinances they have kept as a mystic charm, — they have talked, and preached, and sung about their absent, their ascended Lord; but his living, active, transforming spirit they have been slow to invoke. Therefore is it, that the church might have been fittingly addressed in the prophet's apostrophe: "O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted." But the point has now, it seems to me, been reached, when the church has begun to awaken Jesus with its cry for aid, for life, — "Save, Lord, or we perish."

To drop the figure, which I have thus far pursued, there is, amidst all the jarring interests and conflicting voices of the church, a growing disposition to return to "the simplicity that is in Christ," to inquire his will and do it, to go behind his outward form, behind the dead letter, to his life-giving spirit. Men are asking with more earnestness than formerly, what was the mind, what the life of Christ; and are beginning to regard Christianity as consisting, not in forms and creeds, but in a Christlike life and conversation. This tendency, I say, may be traced throughout the church, that is, in all its divisions, not in all its members; for there are, in every branch of the church, those that join not in the appeal to the divine Master. But this tendency is breaking up the old divisions of the church, is casting down its partition walls, is threatening to obliterate its ancient landmarks, and will marshal the Christian host anew, according to the distinctness, with which they recognise and avow the spirit of Christ as the sole standard of piety. The question of conformity to Christ's example, which has hitherto been altogether secondary, promises to take precedence of all others.

Among existing sects, (if existence may still be affirmed of those now rent and discordant bodies, which used to be bound together by leaden bonds of nominal unity, in the torpid state

miscalled peace,) among existing sects, there is not one, which may be said to have had any Christian idea or principle for the basis of its union. The Platonic mystery of the trinity, the metaphysical dogma of predestination with its consequences, an extrinsic atonement, a work of grace wrought anywhere but in the sinner's heart, a prescribed mode of genuflexion, a set form of words in public praise and prayer, a peculiar mode of descent through finger's ends of (so called) spiritual gifts, — these have been the points of union and of disagreement. For these have men overlooked the great essentials of a Christlike life and spirit, — have maintained fellowships like those cemented by the old Tyrrene tyrant, who used to tie the living and the dead, face to face, — have disclaimed fellowship with the purest and most heavenly spirits, that could not utter the demanded sectarian shibboleth. But what marvellous unions are now daily taking place, — marvellous, not on account of the actual discrepancy of the parties brought together, but on account of the height of the fences which they have had to leap, in order for hand to join hand, and heart to beat within reach of heart ! Men of kindred spirit are somehow feeling their way into each other's communion ; and this is the case, not only with men of kindred excellence, philanthropy, and piety, but also with men of kindred mysticism, formalism, and dogmatism.

The ultra-spiritualists have had contributions to their ranks from every separate body of believers, — some from the cathedral shadow, some from the cloister of Calvinism, others from the Quaker meetinghouse, and others still from the churches, which, though planted by the stern, old Puritans, profess to have reformed upon their creed and spirit. And, though, to us proselytes of the gate, the utterances of the motley group recal the miracle of Babel, and their writings seem sepulchres, out of the pale of any resurrection promise for whatever of thought they may contain, though Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia, seem to speak each in his separate language, and certainly more like men filled with new or old wine, than otherwise inspired, yet each acknowledges the jargon of every other to be "his own tongue, wherein he was born."

The new development of a lifeless formalism, a material religion, which has taken place in one portion of the church, is not mere Oxfordism. It has the full and hearty sympathy

of formalists of every name, and there are those of every division of the church, who wish and utter for it a hearty God-speed ; for it recognises the principle, on which each sets his own peculiar forms above the power of godliness. The Baptist, who thinks more of the baptism of water than of that of the spirit, — the Quaker, who cares more for the fashion of his raiment, or the form of his speech, than for the simplicity of a guileless heart, — he of any sect, who deems assent to a complex creed the fulfilling of the law, — all these are of one spirit, feel themselves united, express free and cordial sympathy with each other ; for each believes that, if the principle of formalism be once established, his own mode of formalism must become supreme.

But especially are those of every name, who take the spirit and the life of Jesus for their creed and ritual, feeling their way to one fold, thus verifying the old prediction to Zion : “ Then shalt thou see, and flow together, and thine heart shall be enlarged.” The manifestation of the children of God to each other, for which the whole creation has groaned and travailed, begins to be realized. There has been, all the church and all the world over, a forth-putting of kindly and liberal feeling, which the wildest visionary could not have dreamed of twenty years ago. Even between the venerable mother church and her anathematized Protestant daughters, filaments of union are going forth. Reiterated expressions of toleration, sympathy and Christian fellowship towards Protestants, marked the closing years of the saintly Cheverus, then a peer of France. Father Mathew’s name is claimed and felt as the property of the whole church ; and he is on terms of intimate communion with leading friends of man, of various sects on both sides the Atlantic. This good man also, in sympathy with the movements of Protestant Bible Societies, is actively engaged in the distribution of the holy scriptures, and, with the approbation of most of the Romish prelates in Ireland, is printing a cheap edition of the Douay version of the Bible, of which he writes ; “ Had I pecuniary resources equal to my wishes, every one of the six millions of converts to the principles of temperance in this kingdom should have a copy of the blessed book before the end of the year.” Then among the dignitaries of that most exclusive of all hierarchies, the established church of England, we find Archbishop Whately pleading for the full church-standing of

uncircumcised Presbyterians and Independents, and maintaining, by the joint power of argument and ridicule, the absurdity of prelatical assumption, the hollowness of all pretence to apostolical succession, the equality of Christian priesthood among all, who exercise it in the fear of God and the love of Jesus. Yet more strange, we see Maurice, a high Churchman in all his tastes and preferences, — a man, who will not for himself bate the least tittle from the canons and the rubric, — yet, with the grace of God in his heart, in a rich vein of true Christian charity, going forth through the whole church, not forgetting the rite-hating Quaker, or the creed-despising Unitarian, seeking out the positive side of every form of doctrine, the elements of truth that lie at the basis of every sectarian organization, exhibiting each denomination as discharging a needed ministry and doing its part of the Redeemer's work, and setting forth the beautiful conception of a temple of truth and piety, to which all will not only flock in the latter days, but towards the construction of which each sect will bring its separate and essential contribution. Or, in illustration of the same tendency, I might refer to the memory of our own revered and beloved Channing, whose name fifteen years ago was an offence and a byword, except among Unitarians, (and the more timid of them dared not own him without apology or abatement,) but whose death called forth testimonials of the sincerest honor, and the most heartfelt sorrow, from brethren of every name and sect on both sides the Atlantic. Or, I might point you, in illustration of this same tendency, to what is now witnessed at all the great philanthropic reunions, where those from every section of the church take sweet and fraternal counsel together, unite in prayer, pledge their combined influence and effort, and make common cause in putting away sin and bringing in everlasting righteousness. In the religious community, bigotry has ceased to be obtrusive. Its voice, though still heard, is like the voice of one crying in the desert. Virtual Christian recognition is perpetually occurring among those, who used literally to deem themselves, not only *toto celo*, but *et inferno*, apart from each other.

An eloquent expositor of prophecy maintains, that we are close upon the sounding of the seventh Apocalyptic trumpet, and the voice of that trumpet is, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ." This, he supposes, is a proclamation to be virtually made by the com-

bined host of God's elect, gathered from out of the whole church — a proclamation, which they will be prepared to make good, by earnest, unremitting effort. This I firmly believe, and can see already, though violence and strife are still abroad, the mustering of the host, which shall send this cry through earth and heaven, and shall rest not day or night, till "the mystery of God be finished;" which mystery is, Paul being our interpreter, that the Gentiles, the nations of the earth, shall all be "fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of the promise in Christ by the Gospel." To many minds I know that the present appears dark, and that clouds seem gathering thick and fast. But to my eye, these clouds, black and heavy as they are, are only flitting across the firmament, not gathering there. The present is an epoch, rather than an age — an epoch, when the elements are deeply moved, when the sky lowers, when old foundations are breaking up, only to prepare for the establishment of those new heavens and that new earth, wherein righteousness shall dwell. If throughout the church the thrones are being cast down; I verily believe that it is, that the Ancient of days may sit, and that his may be "the kingdom, and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven."

You will perceive, brethren, from the tenor of my remarks, that I recognise an approximation towards a threefold division in the church. There are discernible among all denominations three distinct tendencies — one a tide setting resistlessly on towards the new Jerusalem era of the church; the other two strong counter-currents, which will ultimately be overborne, but against which the present and the coming generation must not only take favor of the tide, but spread the full sail and speed the strenuous oar. The tide is that of literal Christian piety — the recognition, love, service, imitation of Jesus as the way, the truth, and the life. On this are borne all who believe the kingdom of God to be "not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the holy spirit." The fiercest counter-current is that of formalism, (whether as to rites or creeds, for it is all one,) — adherence to the mere outside of religion — preference of the husk above its contents, of the means rather than the end — a disposition to make the kingdom of God mere meat and drink, and that not nourishing meat or refreshing drink, but the puff-balls of ritual service and compliance, or the indigestible compounds of dogmatic theology.

The other counter-current flows from this. It is ultra-spiritualism — pseudo-transcendentalism. This springs from the barren rituals and the dead, bony theology, which have of late filled the church. In these, nominal Christians had kept the Saviour's body embalmed for many years. These creeds and forms had been represented as containing the whole of Christianity. The Master himself, his spirit, his love, his piety, his spotless example, had been almost divorced from his religion. But rays of the true light have broken in upon the minds of some, who cannot or will not trace them to their source, and who, identifying Christ with the formalism and dogmatism that have passed current under his name, have taken it upon themselves to talk and write irreverently of his name, of testimony, authority, and historical Christianity, and to boast themselves as authors of what they drew, and could have drawn from him alone. Their blindness will not last long. They must and will be won to a humble, childlike faith, by the exhibition of a catholic, loving, Scriptural, Christ-revering, Christ-following piety, which the better portion of the church will soon present. Formalism, (under which name I include dogmatism as a species of it,) will yield more slowly; for it has nothing in common with practical piety — the two might flow between the same banks for a thousand centuries without mingling their waters. Formalism cannot be converted; but in good time will be dried up.

Permit me now to recur to two or three features of our own New England community, which favor the development among us of the main tendency of the church towards vital, practical godliness, and which check and counteract the tendencies to hyper-spirituality, and to grovelling formalism.

One of these features is the fearless freedom, with which religious opinions of all kinds are now professed and advocated. This is a new feature, and consequently an alarming one to those, with whom novelty is always dangerous. A few years ago, only one shade of religious sentiment could be expressed with safety by those who held a good name in high esteem. Over the whole community was spread a calm, profound, yet delusive; for the elements of discord were there — the waters of strife were mingled, though stagnant. It was not love, but conscious weakness and mutual dread, that kept back the free expression of thought and feeling. The community appeared united in the profession and belief of a moderate form of ortho-

doxy. But there were exclusionists, who waited only the right moment to raise the cry of heresy, and to hurl denunciations and anathemas. There were men of every shade of liberal sentiment, who, for fear of being cast out of the synagogue, made the light that was in them darkness. The demoralizing influence of the revolutionary war, and the influence of French principles and sentiments, that grew up with and after the war, spread the poison of infidelity far and wide among all classes and orders of men; but few dared publicly to avow their unbelief. Paine's infamous works were sent forth by thousands through the country; but none could tell who sent them. Corrupt fountains were flowing through the land; but none could trace them to their source. How much more propitious to the cause of truth and righteousness is the present aspect of society, when, though the same things still be done, they are not done in a corner? Every shade of belief and unbelief is now openly avowed. Every creed of religion and of irreligion now has its fearless advocates and professors. Hypocrisy no longer cripples truth upon her march. Her progress is no longer trammelled by the machinations of traitors, clustering close around her banner. Her army has indeed lost in numbers; but it has gained vastly more in strength, for it enlists only the chosen and the faithful. The influence of each particular system of belief may now be clearly seen and accurately traced. The fire of public scrutiny must try each man's work, and his creed must be judged by its fruits. Thus error will be cast out, on account of its corrupting tendency, while the simple truth as it is in Jesus will be owned, cherished, and embraced, on account of its power to make and keep men virtuous and holy. The truth must ultimately triumph — all that it needs is a fair field to compete with erroneous and defective views. And by having now this open field for competition, a simple, scriptural piety, which magnifies the weightier matters of the law, justice, truthfulness, and mercy, while still it leaves not the others undone, must bear fruit so beyond all comparison fairer, than either a stupid formalism, or a self-styled spiritualism, which spurns the yoke of daily duty and the burden of charity, as to make their barren worthlessness a fact too obvious for question.

Another feature of our age and community, which augurs well for the church, is the philanthropic spirit, which visibly pervades all denominations of Christians — their growing en-

gagedness in efforts for the temporal and spiritual good of the race. We all can remember the time, when there was little or no feeling abroad, with regard to the well-being of the ignorant and degraded. So long as every clergyman visited at distant intervals the poor and afflicted of his own flock, so long as every town had its almshouse for the indigent, and every county its jail for the guilty, so long as direct appeals to pity received some good degree of attention from individual Christians, all was thought to be going on well; the demands of charity were deemed sufficiently answered, and the worst forms of suffering and sin were left out of mercy's reach. And when a spirit of philanthropy was first awakened among us early in the present century, so blind were Christians to the claims of thousands and tens of thousands of our own countrymen, that they commenced by sending missionaries across the ocean. Within the last twenty years, however, the drunkard, the prisoner, the seaman, the slave, the ignorant of our cities, those altogether born in sin, have seen the light, and felt the genial warmth of Christian philanthropy. And though vice and misery yet abound, and the love of many nominal Christians is cold, what a vast and noble host do we see waging incessant war with all that mars the earthly peace or the heavenly birthright of any child of God! You can now find no man, who in any way impresses you as a man of an excellent and Christlike spirit, who is not engaged heart and hand in some of these so various forms of philanthropic effort. And in all these good works, true Christians of every name unite — they learn each other's worth — they trace in each other marks of the same lineage and kindred — they are drawn nearer and nearer to each other — they already cherish a far closer spiritual union than they dare to own. Meanwhile these philanthropic movements are every day widening the breach, (however closely creeds and forms may bind it,) are widening the breach between Christ's true family, and those who are too æsthetic in their piety to stoop to men's infirmities, or too stupid formalists to think of aught beyond the mint, anise, and cumin.

A third propitious feature of our times and community is the new interest in religious matters, now taken by the great body of the laity. Until within the present century, the clergy bore entire sway in all things pertaining to the church. The altar was deemed theirs exclusively; and, whether they kindled a holy or a strange fire upon it, it was suffered to burn unmo-

lest. They dictated articles of faith to their congregations ; and compelled uniformity of belief, if not by civil power, by frowns and menaces. The light of God's word shone upon their hearers mainly through the medium of their own minds and hearts ; and, though most of them were men of sound minds and devout hearts, they were not without their prejudices and their follies. They perpetuated their influence too, from generation to generation, by the authority of ecclesiastical councils, often so employed as to put down worthy teachers whom the people craved. The pilgrim fathers indeed erected a barrier against clerical tyranny, by vesting the right of ordination in the people ; but there are not more than three instances on record, in which the people availed themselves of the right, and the clergy very early denied it, and succeeded in numerous instances in suppressing its exercise. Religion was quietly left to the clergy, as an affair in which thought or preference could hardly be expected from a layman, and in which passive obedience was his greatest merit. But the sceptre has now gone from the hands of the priesthood. An appeal lies open from their doctrines or counsels to the word of God. Laymen now deem it their duty and their privilege to search and decide for themselves, and are often guilty of what would, half a century ago, have been regarded as the acme of heaven-daring audacity, of arriving at different conclusions from their ministers. Every man is his own theologian. Unless prevented by inordinate self-conceit, he employs whatever light his minister's superior conversance with such topics may afford ; but he uses the mind of one thus versed in sacred things as an aid, instead of following it as an infallible guide. This state of things, though it may at first tempt the less modest of the laity to unwarrantable encroachments, and the weaker vessels among the clergy to sycophancy, must ultimately place the clerical profession on the footing, on which every profession ought to stand, namely, on the personal ability and worth of its members. It will raise the standard of clerical attainments and character, and will oblige the clergy to keep up with the age instead of lagging behind it, to cultivate literature and science, and to watch for the public peace and good. It will leave no beds of down for clerical drones ; but it will give every one, who has the power and will to be a faithful ambassador of Christ, a post of extensive usefulness and high honor. The clergy as a profession have nothing

to fear, and much to hope. What they lose in arbitrary, prescriptive authority, they will more than gain in intelligence and moral influence, if they are only faithful to themselves and their Master. This diffusion of new light, this creation of individual interest in religion, this taking religion into their own hands on the part of the laity, portends indeed the approach of the time, when all the disciples of Christ shall be "kings and priests unto God"; but chief priests will then be needed as leaders in social worship and public charities, as guides in serious inquiry, as counsellors to the young and unwary, as sons of consolation to the grief-stricken. And how much more dignified will the clerical office be, when preachers, instead of preaching, as they so often have, to torpid congregations, and ever and anon crying out in despair, "can these dry bones live," shall minister to communities, where there are all around them minds alive to the importance of divine truth, and hearts touched by the power of heavenly grace. As to the tendencies of the church, this decline of religion by proxy is in every aspect encouraging and propitious. True religion is personal in itself, and in all its applications and uses, and can never therefore be the concern of corporations or a priesthood. Nor can Christian union take place between ministers in their official capacity, or between congregations collectively considered, but only between individual souls; and whatever tends to make religion every man's own work and duty, hastens the establishment of a spiritual union among Christians on the basis of personal piety.

I now ask your attention to a few practical hints, founded on the foregoing discussion, with regard to the duty of individual Christians, and especially of the members of that division of the church to which we belong.

I have spoken of the growing tendency of the church, on the one hand to formalism, and on the other to ultra-spiritualism. Against both these tendencies it concerns us carefully to guard both ourselves, and the flocks committed to our charge.

First, against formalism. At first sight, it might seem superfluous to lift a voice against formalism in our own portion of the Christian fold. Our forms are few and simple, and yet there are many among us, who leave even those unheeded. Yet, among those, who are rigid in their observance of our unpretending ritual, we often discern an over-willingness to rely

upon it, as if it were the end of the law, and not the means of keeping it. This is especially the case with the Lord's supper. It seems to me that many do concentrate in that one observance almost the whole of their piety. The fact that they are communicants gives them a quiet assurance of their right to the Christian name on earth, and the Christian's reward in heaven. They may lead lives, no matter how selfish and grovelling,—they may leave their families without either the form or the power of godliness,—they may push religion utterly out of their business and their pleasure,—they may act only on wordly maxims, and be always ready to sacrifice principle to policy,—still the consecrated bread and wine are to them as a mystic charm, a seal of the divine covenant, a substitute for every other manifestation of faith and obedience. Now talk as we may about the mummerly of the Romish ritual, and the absurdity of those who are going back to the dark ages for religious light, and who find that light in the flame of an altar, candle; or the glow of a censer, theirs is a far more rational and respectable formalism, than any that can subsist among us. Theirs is at least majestic and imposing. Its pomp and glitter give to an outward ritual the resemblance of something real, substantial, grand. But our forms, in their primitive, unadorned simplicity, seem to say in a language, which none can misinterpret, "We of ourselves are nothing,—we are merely the vehicles, on which the devout soul may be borne into a spiritual presence, and may hold felt converse with its unseen Father and Redeemer."

We need, in the next place, to take and give the warning against what is often called ultra-spiritualism, for which however self-sufficiency would be a better name. I use this word, not as a term of reproach, but simply as a descriptive, graphic word. Some, in our times, who put forth high pretensions to spirituality, think and speak disparagingly of revelation, of authority, of set seasons, and outward forms,—they maintain the sufficiency, the infallibility of their own intuitions,—they are a law unto themselves, and no other law comes with authority to bind them. Taste, impulse, instinct, is their supreme rule of life. Christianity, so far as it reflects their own convictions, they consent to treat respectfully; but it can add nothing to what they are taught by the inward light. The decline of traditional authority, the

breaking up of time-hallowed religious institutions, the jarring of rival sects and of rival factions in the same sect, all tend at the present time to unsettle the faith of men for what comes with divine authority, and bears the seal of God. But let us, brethren, pass from the warning power of human dictation to the word of Jehovah and the testimony of Jesus. Let us not yield up our implicit, confiding faith at the bidding of philosophy falsely so called; for true philosophy is the handmaid of faith, showing man his finiteness, his littleness, his limited power and scope of vision, opening to him a universe of truth, in which none but God can guide him, and assuring him that there must be depths of wisdom in the divine mind, which can be reached only through the medium of revelation. Nothing so becomes the creature of but yesterday, as implicit faith and trust in Him, who is from eternity to eternity. And it is this faith, this trust alone, that is adequate to high and worthy results. All the great and holy men of God, the missionaries, the philanthropists, the martyrs, the revered exemplars of Christian excellence, those whose names are dear to every Christian heart, have been, with not a solitary exception, men of submissive, childlike faith, men who bowed their own spirits to the sway of Jesus of Nazareth, who felt their own ignorance and infirmity, and sought to know all things only as he taught them, and to do all things only as he strengthened them. Faith, and faith alone, has subdued sin, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, and out of weakness been made strong. And look abroad now where you will, do you find a man, consistent in his whole life, faithful alike to great and to little duties, rendering their dues equally to God and to Cæsar, to the church and to the world, living at peace and in charity with all men, and engaged in labors of beneficence, not only when sustained by the excitement and sympathy of crowds, but also when alone, unaided, opposed, reproached, that man you will find, not relying on his own intuitions or inward light, but a humble, modest learner at the feet of Jesus, and follower in his steps. Show me one man, who, leaning on his own understanding, when he might have had the aid of revealed religion, has made himself as faultlessly and eminently worthy, as a meek and lowly faith in Jesus is making not a few in every walk of life,—show me the one without faith, who can be placed among the very many that

excel through faith ; and that one man shall convert me from a preacher of Christ into a preacher of my own self, and of every body's self; for that one man will convince me of the possibility of what I now deem impossible, namely, the attainment of true spiritual greatness without "receiving the kingdom of heaven as a little child."

To pass to another head of practical advice, let me urge, as imperatively demanded by the signs and tendencies of the times, the cultivation in our congregations of a more profound and accurate religious knowledge, and of more definite views of Christian truth, than now exists among the people at large. I am afraid that there is too much need of this suggestion. The scriptural and religious knowledge of our generation is exceedingly superficial ; and there are multitudes engaged in the various forms and works of religious activity and zeal, who can hardly tell what they believe, much less give a reason for it. They see so much for the Christian to do, that they will not give themselves time to learn. On the same principle, because the harvest seemed so great, might we, brethren, have stepped from College into the pulpit in our boyhood, without giving ourselves any discipline of theological culture. But for this we should have been justly rebuked, and, however ardent our zeal for Christ, we should have led a feeble, vagrant, useless ministry, only cumbering by our activity a larger surface of ground, than if we had lain still. But why should our parishioners, any more than ourselves, undertake to do the work of Christ, without entering into his mind, understanding his truth, informing themselves of his doctrine ? May not their intended good be turned into evil by their ignorance ? May they not infuse into the anxious, sin-burdened, or afflicted soul, yet more perplexity or distress, when they mean to be sons of consolation ? May they not utter, sanction, encourage maxims, ways of thinking, forms of activity, which a closer study of the truth of Christ would show to be unchristian ? And at any rate, the more they know of divine truth, the more conversant they become with the treasures of revelation, the stronger and the better furnished are their minds, the more devout and energetic are their souls ; and, if it be with mind and soul that they are to do their Master's work, then does it become them to cultivate that mind and soul to the highest point possible. All truth is from God, and is

sanctifying. On all subjects connected with God, Christ, duty, eternal life, some knowledge is of course indispensable to the humblest measure of piety ; and it needs no labored demonstration to show that, in proportion to the accuracy and thoroughness of a man's knowledge on these points, (other things being equal,) his piety will be profound and fruitful, or shallow and unedifying.

And then, as to the scriptures, if written by men whom the spirit of God touched and moved, must they not deserve, from the private Christian as well as from the professed theologian, not only cursory reading, but that close, critical, searching scrutiny into their contents, which many seem to hold in light esteem ? Is it not reasonable to suppose that, while some of the treasures of revelation lie upon the surface, others by divine wisdom hidden beneath the surface, to meet the eye and reward the toil of him only, who digs for truth "as for hid treasures" ? Such has been the experience of all who have made the trial. Nay, in thus digging, we always find more than we seek. When we dig for brass, we find gold, and when for gold, diamonds of the rarest beauty blaze upon our sight. Often a train of inquiry, that is entered upon without enthusiasm, and with but little expectation of entertainment or profit, as we follow it up, will lead us through an illuminated labyrinth of rich and beautiful thought, of glowing sentiment, of materials for the most exalted and elevating contemplation. How often, in my scriptural researches, have I been reminded of one of those caverns in the Arabian Nights, where you enter through a low, dark passage, and for a while grope your way through stones and rubbish, but soon come into a room blazing with light and sparkling with gold and jewels, and then into another, and another, and another still richer and more splendid ! Oh, how have I been mortified to hear professing Christians, nay, persons who called themselves Christian teachers, express an utter distaste, indifference, nay, aversion for any means of a more accurate, scriptural, and religious knowledge, than they can pick up by the wayside without study or effort ! But I cannot enlarge upon this topic. I have introduced it in the present connexion, because the actively philanthropic character, which the church is assuming, while it presents many aspects for which we cannot be too thankful, is attended with this danger of a neglect of that accurate study and

knowledge of the truth and its records, by which alone the Christian can be furnished for a profitable activity, and a wise and judicious philanthropy.

One hint more in conclusion, which I shall not have time to expand as it deserves. I have spoken of the growing tendency to religious union among good men of various denominations. Let it not be supposed that this union is, or ought to be, brought about by a sacrifice of decision, or integrity in the profession and maintenance of each one's individual opinions. It is not a oneness of creed, but an enlargement of heart, for which we are to strive. The blessing, which we crave, is not amalgamation, but fraternal society — not unison, but harmony. Now there is a strong temptation, to which some good men yield, in conferring with one of a different creed from our own, to smooth over the rough points of our belief, to fabricate coincidences, and to seek Christian recognition on the ground of similarity of doctrine; and some will indulge in a sort of sanctified boasting over the truces with those of other sects, which by management of this kind they can make for themselves, while their more straightforward brethren are left still under the ban and the anathema. Unions, into which weak, though good men thus smuggle themselves, are no specimens of the union to be desired and sought, nay, I verily believe, to be hoped and realized among Christians. I do not want to be recognised as a Christian by my Calvinistic brother, because I can ape his phraseology, and sew Genevan technicalities upon primitive Unitarianism, like new cloth upon an old garment. I do not want him to say, "Yes, you may possibly be a Christian; for you use such and such words and tones like us, and have fallen into some of our measures; but I cannot say the same for your brethren, who adhere to the simple phraseology of the Bible, whose speech has no orthodox twang, and who reject our peculiar measures." I want him to say, and I believe that the time is coming when every good man will be ready to say to every other, "We differ, nay, differ widely as to the metaphysics and technicalities of religion. We differ on points, which both you and I regard as of commanding interest and high importance. On these points do you preach your views, and I will preach mine; and to our common Master we will stand or fall. But because you and I are alike seeking to breathe his spirit and live his life, because

we agree in making him our only standard of duty and of piety ; therefore I give and take the hand of fellowship." May God hasten the time when such a fellowship shall bind all the disciples on earth, and make the church below like that above.

A. P. P.

FREE RESPONSIBLE AGENCY.

EVERY man knows himself to be a free responsible agent. He is conscious of it. He, also, believes and asserts it of other men. If there have been a few persons, of a speculative and skeptical spirit, who questioned and quibbled on this subject, yet even while they did it, the unaffected dictates of their own consciousness belied the affected dubiousness on their tongues. All men believe it both in regard to themselves and others. They, moreover, act on this principle, charging blame or imputing merit, according to the moral character of their own and others' motives and deeds.

Notwithstanding all this, however, the subject is involved in some obscurity. A darkness rests upon it. Free moral agency is a thing of difficult analysis. It is a nice and delicate task to define it. We doubt whether a correct and satisfactory definition of free responsible agency was ever written or uttered. Great minds have labored abundantly on this subject, and not without some good result. If they have not accomplished all at which they aimed, yet there is no adequate cause for despair. Difficult points of science are mastered by slow approaches. He, who does not strike the mark in its centre, may not have spent his strength in vain.

It being universally acknowledged that man is a free moral agent, and that he only of all the beings on earth is man, it follows, of course, that if we can define man, showing his peculiar and true characteristic; we shall, at the same time, have developed the characteristic of a free responsible agent. And

though this is only changing the relative positions of the point of inquiry, it may, however, be some facility to our investigation. The inquiry now is, not whether man be a free moral agent, for that point is acknowledged, but what man is? What are the great principles of man's constitution, and by what peculiarity does he differ from other earthly and living creatures? With this question in view, we offer the following statements and observations.

1. Man possesses the power of self-agency. This power is not, however, incommunicable nor independent. It was given to him by his Divine Creator. Man possesses a constitution. And one of its principles is self-agency; and it is acted by a force within itself. But this power is not peculiar to man. It is not, consequently, his proper characteristic. All other living creatures and living things have a natural constitution and the power of self-agency. Every kind of grass, plant, and tree has the power of self-action. A clod of dead matter, being destitute of this power, can only be acted upon, but cannot act of itself. But a living vegetable acts by a power within itself; it grows, buds, blossoms, bears fruit, puts forth leaves, sheds them, and then repeats the whole process of fructification. The power, by which it does this, is a principle of self-agency. It is its life. When this principle is withdrawn, it is dead — because there is now in it no principle of self-action; it yields to the influences from without, having no power to resist them; it decays and is decomposed into its primitive and simple elements. This endowment of life — of a principle of self-action — extends throughout the whole vegetable and animal worlds. All else is dead. Whatever possesses this, is alive. It has the power of self-agency.

2. Man has the power of voluntary agency. He can act from choice or volition; he moves certain parts of his body by an act of will; by dint of choice and purpose he can effectively fix on a course of action of thought and pursuit. He chooses one thing in preference to another, because it better pleases him, and he acts accordingly. It is a wonderful power. The possession and exercise of it constitutes mental freedom. Man is endowed with this faculty; but it is not peculiar to him. It is, of course, not his true characteristic. All living creatures upon earth are, also, endowed with it; the worm, the insect, the reptile, the fish, the fowl, and the quadruped.

They act by volition; they will a particular motion, and that motion takes place. If man did not possess this power, he could not be a free agent; yet it is not this that constitutes his moral freedom and responsibility; for the insects, the fishes, and the fowls are free agents, but they are not moral, not responsible. They cannot understand a prescriptive law and act by it. They incur no guilt by doing harm; they acquire no moral merit by doing good. For they are ignorant of the distinction between right and wrong.

3. Man possesses the power of rational agency. The principle of this is reason; the power of discerning the difference between true and false; between reality and fiction. It is the power of knowledge. It takes note of the changes which occur, and of the relations between cause and effect. It traces out consequences from given and known premises or data; it anticipates the future from the present; it generalizes and makes abstractions; it is a different power from instinct. The latter seeks its end without calculation; without knowledge; without the aid of experience. Instinct looks at its end as one entire whole; reason analyzes into parts and parcels; instinct is blind to all chances and difficulties; but never weighs them carefully in the balance. Reason learns, improves, and makes progress indefinitely; instinct, at its first leap, makes one astonishing bound forward, and there it stands still forever. Instinct is the characteristic of all creatures on earth, with the exception of man; it is their guide and governor; it directs them to their means of sustenance, of protection, and of welfare. But man, being rational, employs reason for the attainment of his various ends; it is the light that reveals the path in which to walk. Man, however, is not entirely without instinct; nor are all brute animals wholly destitute of reason; the dog, the ox, the horse, the elephant, sometimes give manifestations of intellect and thought; they make calculations, and adapt means to the accomplishment of ends. Other animals, though less frequently, also give indications of mental effort; and just in proportion as reason acts, instinct is superceded. On the other hand, when, and so long as a man is moved by instinct, his reason sleeps. And when an animal acts under the dictates of reason, his instinct sleeps; it is controlled. While an infant, man is instinctive, and occasionally afterwards; the animal character of his actions is rational; but the general

character of brute-action [is instinctive. Instinctive agency is irresponsible ; but rational agency is responsible. If man were not endued with reason, he would not be accountable. He could have no idea of law or of duty. He could neither understand a command, nor yield obedience to it. When a man loses his reason, he ceases to be a subject of moral obligation. If he become insane, he becomes irresponsible, in proportion to the extent of his mental alienation. Rational agency is responsible, because it can, and should, be governed by knowledge, by principle, by law, and truth. It is the office of reason to control instinct, and appetite, and passion.

4. Man is endued with the power of moral sensibility and discrimination. He is capable of the sentiments of guilt and of self-justification ; of blame and of praise. The foundation of these sentiments is a moral sensibility ; a feeling of moral right and wrong, of moral good and evil in their own nature, distinct from both antecedents and consequences. Reason cannot make this distinction. It can distinguish true from false, and right from wrong, in the relation of means to ends ; but not the right and wrong which implies guilt and blame, on the one hand ; praise and justification, on the other. Without a moral sensibility, man could count, and calculate and generalize ; be a mathematician and a philosopher ; a statesman and a politico-economic ; he might be capable both of self-love and of benevolence ; and of acting on the principles of expediency and utility ; but never on those of moral propriety ; never on those of moral desert and demerit. For he would be a stranger to the meaning of the words, guilt, blame, innocence, praise, approbation, conscience, integrity, and others, which bear a moral import. There would, of course, be no such words in human language. And there would not be such a thing as proper moral good or evil, in the world. Without this, commands and prohibitions, proceeding from the highest authority, could have no moral sanction. They might be backed by the strongest considerations of power and utility, but not by a particle of moral force. Such must have been the human world without the sentiment of moral sensibility. But with it, as the fact is, moral distinctions are made. There are such things as desert, merit, praise, blame, justification, condemnation, guilt, punishment. And there is moral agency. A man is blamable or justifiable,

punishable or rewardable for what he does, while in the full possession of all his constitutional powers. But if any of these are impaired or lost, his moral agency, in the same proportion, is gone also. A moral agent must be previously, in the order of nature, a self-agent, a voluntary agent, and a rational agent ; and yet all these together do not make him a moral being. He becomes man by possessing a moral sense, which, in connexion with reason, constitutes conscience, — God's law written upon the heart of universal man, accusing or excusing themselves and others for their deeds and conduct.

Blame and praise, in their most strict and proper sense, are personal sentiments. No man can be made guilty but by the condemnation of his own heart. He may be sentenced and imprisoned and tormented, but all this is not truly punishment ; is not the real wages of sin. A transgressor must have a conscience, and this conscience must be violated, or he cannot be a sinner. And none but a sinner can be a subject of guilt and punishment.

We have thus endeavored to describe a free moral agent. He must possess a principle of self-agency ; of voluntary agency ; of rational agency ; and a moral sensibility. Without the first, he cannot act of himself ; without the second, he cannot act freely, from choice ; without the third, he cannot act understandingly ; and without the fourth he cannot have moral sentiments, nor make moral distinctions, nor feel the sentiments of guilt and blame, of praise and justification. And such an agent is man ; for he is possessed of all these attributes. His great distinction, however, is reason. It is in this, that he resembles God, his Creator. God possesses reason, but not organized life upon which all creative self-agency is constituted. God has no appetites, no passions, no instincts. The moral sense in man is much of the character of instinct. It acts without the process of reasoning. Like instinct, it grasps its whole object at once, immediately. It is reason that renders man a subject of progress. Instinctive agents make no advances. The first nest ever made by the robin, the first dam ever built by the beaver, the first honey-comb ever constructed by the bees, were as perfect as any which have since been produced by them. But the first attempts of man, in the way of art, are rude. The second are better, but not until the hundredth or thou-

sandth, perhaps, does he arrive at the comparatively perfect. But there are no assignable bounds to his progress. He can be always growing ; always making advances onward and upward. This is man's prerogative, it is the offspring of his reason. He can improve in both knowledge and goodness ; can add to his faith hope ; and to hope purity ; and to purity self-denial ; and to self-denial godliness ; and to godliness the love of his neighbor ; and to this charity toward all men. And in these excellencies, he may abound more and more. Looking unto Jesus, the Author, Finisher, and Exemplar of our faith, he is changed into the same image from glory to glory.

We can conceive how man might have been a holy being, without having been made a rational and a moral agent. He might have been endued with strong holy instincts ; with an instinct for justice, for truth, for faithfulness, for diligence, for mercy, for the veneration and worship of God. Thus instinctively endued, man might have always been industrious, regular, upright, affectionate, merciful, and pious ; uniformly good and holy. But with all these, he would not have been a moral, nor a progressive being. A moral being acts by an objective, prescribed rule, not merely by a subjective law. A moral being employs knowledge, he judges and balances between principles and inclination ; between profit and pleasure ; between duty and self-interest. No deed is properly a moral act, if it have been entirely spontaneous, instinctive. It may be very good, but it is not strictly rewardable, not having been done from moral principle, moral motive. It contains no element of obedience and moral purpose.

There may be such a thing as instinctive holiness. But it is not moral in the most proper sense of the term. For its law is wholly subjective. The subject of it needs no instruction, no knowledge, no threats, no promises. But a creature, actuated by instinct, makes no proficiency. Its condition is stationary. What he is to-day he will be to-morrow, and thus on to the end. He is a voluntary, but not a free agent ; not in the same sense in which man is free. Reason is man's law, not instinct. If he always obeyed this law, he would be indefectible. But such is not the character of his nature. Liability to disobedience, crime, and punishment, is the price which man must pay for his moral freedom. And if under the moral law of reason he grow to the stature

of a perfect saint, he attains perfection which is of a higher order than that which is merely instinctive and subjective.

If what has now been advanced be correct, it is apparent that great mistakes have been made on the subject of free moral agency. Volition has been made the distinctive characteristic of a moral being. Man has been accounted free and accountable, because he possesses the power of will. But if this be fact, then all the animal creation are free moral agents, amenable to prescriptive law ; and are the due subjects of blame and punishment. Yet no man ever believed this doctrine, that beasts, and fowls, and fishes, and insects incur guilt, for not living soberly and righteously. If volition be the distinctive of moral agency, then insane persons and idiots are as much moral beings, rewardable and punishable, as the intelligent and the sane. But none ever subscribed such a belief. By universal consent the idiot, and the mind alienated from reason, are exempted from moral responsibility, though the power of will be as perfect in them, as it is in other men.

The doctrine, however, has been popular, that a voluntary agent is, of course, both free and accountable. Such is the doctrine of Edwards and of the whole Calvinistic school ; it is that volition is the essence of freedom and moral responsibility. This doctrine, very obviously, is a great mistake. For it proves vastly too much ; therefore, it proves nothing ; because manifestly a false argument. Its erroneous character must have been soon detected, had those who employed it been unprejudiced and sincere seekers after truth. But they were controversialists. They wrote for the purpose of defending the favorite doctrines of their theology. For these an auxiliary was sought in psychology. With such an object in view, it was not to be expected of them that they would be impartial. Appearances would be easily set down for realities, the posts of error, in certain points, be driven down the deeper, and the walls of its temple rendered harder and more impregnable.

But why did the Calvinists take so much interest in establishing the doctrine, that volition constitutes the freedom of moral agency ? It was on account of the relation which this doctrine sustains to that of divine decrees and destiny. The Arminians rebelled against the doctrine of destiny, asserting its incompatibility with mental and moral freedom. It was to remove this objection, that the Calvinists labored so strenu-

ously to establish the fact, that destiny and moral freedom were not inconsistent ; that both doctrines were true, and of course, one of them did not disturb the other. The Arminians held and contended that moral freedom consisted with contingency ; not with predestination. The dispute turned upon the point, Is the truth with contingency or with predestination ? Both parties acknowledged the law of moral liberty ; the free and responsible agency of man. One party said, man being free and accountable, there can be no such thing as fate, destiny, absolute and universal decree, for these are incompatible. The other party contended that though man was free and accountable, yet the doctrine of predestination is true, and it perfectly consists with man's moral liberty. Hence it became a point of great importance with the Calvinists to establish the doctrine of predestination, and to reconcile it with that of human liberty ; also a great point with the Arminians to establish the doctrine of contingency, which they alleged must be requisite to man's free agency and accountableness. Undoubtedly there was misapprehension on both sides. It has never, we believe, been fully illustrated that predestination is irreconcilable with mental liberty ; nor clearly shown that both doctrines may not be true. But the discrepancy between the doctrines of contingency and destiny is apparent and palpable. If that of contingency be true, that of destiny must be, more or less, untrue and false. But what is intended by destiny or foreordination ? It implies that God hath decreed whatsoever comes to pass. And the Arminians acknowledged this, to a certain extent. But the two parties interpreted Scripture differently. " God hath chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the spirit, and belief of the truth." This passage, by the Calvinists was understood in its individual sense and application ; that God had elected the subjects of salvation individually, every man in particular, together with the predestination of all the means, conditions, and preparations. The Arminians understood it in a general sense ; that God had elected all who should comply with the conditions of forgiveness and eternal life ; therefore, He had constructively decreed the salvation of all who by repentance make their calling and election sure. An equivocal passage, — and all the Scripture-passages were equivocal, — would not decide a doctrine that was more akin to philosophy than religion. The doc-

trine of destiny, be it true or false, is a philosophical dogma. And it should be discussed and disposed of on the ground of its own merits ; and thus, also, every other doctrine, philosophical or religious. If true, it has its own support ; it stands on its own proper and independent foundation. No doctrine may lie directly on another, as one stone in a column on another. But when two doctrines are made mutually to support by leaning against each other, as do the sides of an arch, their character for truth becomes doubtful. If they cannot stand alone, or the one directly on the other, they are false.

The doctrine of predestination ought, in discussion, to be separated from that of free agency. If it be established, the doctrine of contingency falls. But that of free agency may, perhaps, stand. And how can the question be determined ? Were the Calvinists or the Arminians in the right ? Is predestination general or particular ? Look at the world. On what principles is this great system conducted ? Are they, general, or special ? Does every event indicate itself to be the product of a particular purpose, or only of general laws ? Are the tendencies which move all things in the world, regular, stated, and uniform, or are they so variable that no calculations can be made from them ? Now if the elementary laws of the world of nature be constant, regular, invariable ; if, for instance, the tendency, called gravitation, be, in the same particles, always the same ; if the various attractions and repulsions of air, heat, mineral substances, gasses, and light, be equal at all times ; this fact seems to indicate a general decree. When a particular purpose is to be accomplished by an event, the cause must be modified and adapted to the production of it. Each movement is the work of a distinct act of the will. When a man writes with a pen and makes letters composing words, every movement of his pen is the result of a distinct volition and purpose. But when the printer strikes off whole sheets from the press, the individual letters and words produced are not the objects of a particular but of a general purpose. When the husbandman plants his seed, one kernel at a time, and buries it with his hoe, the planting is particular ; but when he throws it broadcast on the furrow, and covers it with his drag, the planting is general. In both cases, there is purpose, plan, intention ; and so far are they alike. In the former case the

planting of every seed was affected by a distinct act of will ; but in the latter, the purpose, plan, and intention were all of a general character. It is obvious that a degree of contingency obtains where the plan and purpose are general. When a man plants each seed separately, selecting its place and burying it just so deep, contingency is excluded. All is done by particular purpose. But when the seed is sown broadcast, or covered by the drag, it will inevitably happen that some seeds will be better planted than others. The husbandman, however, had no particular design that one seed should be better planted than another. We have employed this similitude for the purpose of making out the distinction between a common and an individual purpose ; between a general and a particular providence.

If the actual providence of God be general, then the Arminian doctrine of contingency is, unquestionably, true. But if all parts of divine Providence be particular, then, obviously, the Calvinistic doctrine of destiny, or predestination, is established. And, it is by acquaintance with providence, itself, that we can for ourselves determine the fact. The Scriptures, being in popular language, are not so specific in their style, as to decide this question.

It is, however, frequently and strongly urged, that divine providence must be particular, in order to be the best. This allegation, however, is wholly assumptive. It is without proof. It takes for granted that a particular providence is a better one than a general. But it would be equally just to make a similar assumption in favor of the other doctrine, and to say, that a general providence is better than a particular, that, therefore, divine providence is general. It is not for man to say what providence it was best for God to adopt. Shall mortal man prescribe for his Maker ? God surely possessed the wisdom requisite to determine. He did decide, when He made the worlds. And it is our part and wisdom to follow after, and not presume to go before, Him. When we have learned what the character of providence is, we may feel sure that that is the best possible. It is ours to learn what the fact is, and not, by abstract reasoning, to determine from our own wisdom, what it ought to be ; what is the best. The Apostle Paul declares that the foolishness of God is wiser than man ; and that the weakness of God is stronger than man.

It is urged that the wisdom of God in respect to the existence of evil cannot be vindicated, except on the principle, that it is designed to be the previous cause of subsequent and overbalancing good. But why is it not as rational to believe that the evil is inherent in the system, and inseparable from it? That evil exists is certain. And there is a certain amount of it. And this amount bears a certain proportion to the sum total of good. And the amount of evil is to be subtracted from the sum total of good, in order to find the balance. The sum total of good must be greater than the balance of good. If the sum total of good could have been produced without any of the attendant evil, the system had been more perfect than it now is. In this case we should have all the good without any of the evil. And why did not the wisdom of God so ordain and establish? We may believe it was impossible. That the actual evil is inherent in the system and inseparable from it. It avails nothing to allege that the evils produce good. For the question immediately comes up; why might not the good be without the evil? And if the answer be, that it is impossible, what different is that from the doctrine, that the evils are inherent in the system, and inseparable from it?

It is very obvious that liability to evils is unavoidable in a general providence. But there are advantages attending such a providence, which could not have been secured by a particular. Under a general providence men can make calculations, employ means, and adapt them to the accomplishment of ends. For all such calculations proceed on the principle, that the tendencies and laws of nature are constant and invariable. And if they are so, then providence is so far general. And so far as it is particular, it is supernatural. Particular providence and supernatural providence are, therefore, identical. Are, then, the tendencies of nature constant and immutable? If this inquiry be correctly answered in the negative, then we may have a particular providence; but if in the affirmative, we have a general. And in a general providence, divine decrees must also be general. All particular ends of providence are connected with supernatural acts. Of this description we must believe there are some; and have been many. But all our power, all our calculations, and our whole duty, have their foundation in a general providence. Such a providence illustrates our free agency

and accountableness. We are God's vineyard, for which He has done all that he could do, and from which He justly expects and commands that we be productive in the fruits of righteousness.

F.

THOUGHTS ON DOCTRINE AND DUTY.

DOCTRINE and Duty. Faith and Life.—What relation do they bear to each other? What is their positive, and what their comparative value, as determined by Christianity, or as they concern our salvation? This, in some form, is one of the great questions of our times, and important at all times. It is a question of difficulty, from various causes; and it may not be capable of receiving a direct answer. It cannot receive such an answer, as most inquirers are apt to demand; one in few words, and of universal truth, without qualification. There are no questions in morals or religion, that can be answered in this way; from the single fact, to omit all others, of the vagueness of common words, and the different ideas for which words stand in different minds, or to the same mind in different relations. This is seen in the question here proposed. And before we attempt to answer it, we must examine its terms, and have an understanding at least as to the meaning we attach to them. Not that we need spend time upon definitions, or that we would insist on the strict original sense. Only let it be understood in what sense we do use terms, and in what sense they are received, and it is of little consequence whether the popular acceptance be strictly accurate or not.

Of the leading terms of the inquiry on which we now enter, we suppose the popular acceptance to be this. Doctrine is that which is *believed*; Duty is that which is *done*. The one is simple Faith, the other actual Life. And the inquiry is, which is best? Which is of most worth, in the eye of God, in the judgment of Christ, as a principle of action, or a term of salvation? Can any one say, concisely and

positively ? Is there a man any where, who could or would answer in a word, where his own or another's soul was depending ? I am sure there is not. And it teaches us that which we may assume as the first position ; viz., that Doctrine and Duty can never be fairly and wholly separated.

This let us observe. Doctrine and Duty are not to be separated. Doctrine is belief. It must stand either for truth received, or for the act of the mind in receiving and holding truth. In either case, it pertains to duty. There is the duty first of seeking truth. There is the duty next of keeping the mind in a healthy state for the action of truth. There is the duty of giving truth full consideration, and giving some attention to all that claims to be truth ; or at least to suffer no prepossessions or passions, present interest or wilfulness, to prevent the approach, or pervert the influence of any truth. And there is the great fact, that all that is truly believed must have some influence, and may have absolute power, over all that is done. Belief, faith, truth or error, doctrine or precept, whatever you call it, and so far as you hold it, makes a part of the mind, a part of the man. It enters into that which he is, affects and often wholly determines that which he does. It forms and fashions the very idea of duty, it strengthens or weakens the sense of obligation, it often takes the name of religion, ascends the throne of conscience, arms itself with the sanction and authority of God, and stands to the individual believer, for that which is right, absolute, commendable and essential.

This is faith, opinion, doctrine. Is it unimportant ? Can it be severed from duty or life ? Is there any view of duty or any work in life, which it may not, and ordinarily must not affect ? What law of our intellectual or moral nature is better established or more universally in action, than that which connects the inner with the outer life, and makes the mind both the indicator and the ruler of the man ? “As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he.” Thought and heart, the earnest opinion, the cherished sentiment — it is this that defines the will, that mighty agent in all. It is this that determines the choice, that fixes the affections, finds affinities below or above, gives even to the visible world its own complexion and power, and much more to the invisible, spiritual, eternal. These are all of faith necessarily. They must depend on that which is thought. They exist in that

and by that which is *believed*. And they make our religion. Our religion is doctrine, and our religion is duty. It is neither alone, it is both united and corresponding. Its essence is Faith, its manifestation is Life. These always have borne, they always will bear, some relation and resemblance each to the other. It will vary in expression and degree, so that the relation may seem at times to be suspended, and the resemblance may be modified by all other circumstances. But it exists, and ever will. Before Christianity and since, under all systems and with all people, the national and the individual faith is an index of the national and individual character. That, which stands for God in the soul, rules in the life. "All people will walk every one in the name of his God."

We admit there are seeming if not real exceptions to this rule, singular separations, and sometimes direct opposition, between faith and life. These we would study. They may teach us discrimination and charity, if nothing more.

First, there is the general fact of inoperative faith, a faith dead, without works of any kind. This is of common observation, and not difficult to be understood. Either it is not faith, in any proper sense of the word, or it is faith in that which is so wholly opposed to nature and experience, that it cannot or will not operate.

It is not faith. How much that is so called exists only in name, need not be shown. We should give it rather the name of doctrine, where it is anything. And this is one case in which doctrine may lead to no duty. It is hereditary and heartless. It is the creature of education, or a thing of system. It stands upon no conviction, upon no examination. It may wear a definite form; they who hold it, or to whom it attaches, may be able to define it in words, though many cannot do even that. But some there are who give it expression, and the form of sound words. They proclaim it aloud, and become vehement if you assail or question it, and condemn all who hold another doctrine. Yet it is in them utterly barren and worthless. You see no fruit, or none but an uncharitable temper. Indeed there may be nothing there, literally nothing, that you can trace to that doctrine. Whatever its name, it has no manner of power. There is emptiness of mind with it, and vanity of life. The life may not be bad, or openly wicked. It is not that

which we are now considering. It is the utter nothingness of so much that is called sound doctrine, whether strict or liberal. And it deserves mention, because, empty as it is, it is often self-complacent, and often denunciatory. It sits in judgment upon that which it has neither the capacity to comprehend, nor the charity to allow, nor the piety to love. There is a deal of fashionable orthodoxy in the church and the world, which deserves mention and reprobation. I use the word 'orthodoxy' in no restricted or sectarian sense, but only as expressing that which is supposed to be 'sound doctrine,' in whatever connection. It may be seen in all connections, and not least among those who have the majority of believers, and claim antiquity for their system. But whether there or among us, let not claims or names deceive us. It is not negative, but of positive injury to the individual and to religion, when those who call themselves, or think themselves, sound in doctrine, are empty in life; when those, who view with suspicion or abhorrence Christians of a different communion, are yet living in frivolity and vanity; seeing heaven open to them because of a nominal creed, but doing nothing for earth, or nothing for their own improvement. It is disheartening and sad, to see men and women, walking on the Sabbath as saints, and living every other day as creatures of the most worldly drudgery, or fashionable folly; slaves to sense, appearance, dress, family pride, and despotic custom, selfish hoarding, and indulged appetite; and at the same time withholding even the Christian name from thousands, who are seeking the truth, subduing the temper, enjoying prayer, encouraging benevolence by word and act, and striving to lead the life of Christ. In such comparison, there can be no question which is better; the barren doctrine, ever so sound, if you can suppose it so, or the active and useful life, striving to do good, though error may belong to its creed.

There is another kind of inoperative faith. It is a belief in that which opposes nature, or is contradicted by all experience. And by opposing nature, I do not mean condemning that which is selfish or sensual in our nature, but the reverse. All truth, all pure religion, condemns the selfish and the sensual. This is one mark of truth, it is the great work of religion, and there is enough in every nature that calls for it. We are all selfish and sensual by nature; and

it is religion only, such religion as that of Christ, that can turn us from this, convict, convert, redeem us. Nor is it right in others to say, that we reject such religion, when we declare that some doctrines oppose our nature, and are therefore inoperative, and proved to be false. They oppose the good, not the evil. They war with that reason, which God himself gave, and which is itself a revelation, and the only interpreter of any revelation. They war with those attributes of God, which we know to be necessary, his justice as we understand justice every where, his mercy and love, as he appeals to them in our own hearts and best state. They war with the word of God, in the Gospel and life of Christ; for they tell us, that 'good works' are little or suspicious, when Christ says they glorify God; they tell us, that the common charities of life are no part of religion, when Christ says they make the principles and test of the final judgment; they tell us, that the whole nature of man is depraved, and all his acts, if not of grace, are of sin, when Christ recognises in the child the image of heaven, and lays the chief stress upon doing the will of God; they tell us that Christ is himself God, when God tells us, 'this is his beloved Son,' and Christ tells us that our Father is his Father, and prays to him, and owns his dependence upon him, declares that he can do nothing without him, dies and is raised by the power of God, and ever liveth to make intercession with him. These are contradictions. These must render any faith, so far as it depends upon them, inoperative; for they oppose themselves, they oppose the universal sense of language, they oppose reason, whether natural or sanctified, they are allowed by the believing and the regenerate themselves to be seeming inconsistencies, and to be received only as unintelligible and awful mysteries. They have caused perplexity and darkness in many of the strongest minds. They have chilled sympathy, and hindered faith, and emboldened skepticism. We firmly believe that in a multitude of cases, where these doctrines have come by inheritance or adoption, they are either negative or hurtful. It is very lately, and very near us, that we knew of a congregation of colored Christians, who supposed themselves Trinitarians, but who, in the simplicity and truthfulness of their nature, declared in common that they could not see, and had never believed, that Christ was God, and yet the mediator between

God and man. We adduce it as a simple and frequent fact, illustrating a class of doctrines believed to be essential, but of themselves inconsistent and inoperative, owing their power, and the good so often found in connexion with them, to other truths or higher influences.

And this shows us yet another kind of separation between doctrine and duty, and may help to explain their actual relation. We see that with an inconsistent, imperfect, and erroneous faith, there may yet be good dispositions, good influences, a good life. We see and know this, whatever view we take of right or wrong in doctrine. Without charging wrong upon any system, or bringing any sect into question, all admit that there are true Christians of every communion, and good men with all kinds of faith. There can be few, we fervently trust there are none, who doubt that there are some of every creed in Christendom, and every system on the earth, who have lived and died in favor with God, and are gathered among his chosen above. There are those who go beyond this, thinking there are as many of the faithful and accepted, in one connection as in another. But this cannot be known, and need not be judged.

Two facts are obvious here, and instructive. One is, that we by no means see, in different churches and sects, that marked difference of conduct or character, which the variance and positiveness of differing Christians would lead us to expect; no such difference ever, as would enable you to go through any community, and divide men into their different sects by ever so close an observation of their lives. You can easily distinguish them by their forms, observances, modes of expression, and channels of influence; and if by these you measure piety, you may draw the lines at once. But if you look only at the actual life, still more if you could look at the actual springs of life, the temper at home, the daily conversation, the habit of prayer, the purity of purpose, and power of principle — would you be willing to stake the soundness of your creed, to test the truth of any doctrine, by such scrutiny? No. You would find some of the best hearts and lives where many see the worst heresy; and also, some of the worst hearts and lives with the best sounding and most assured creed. And what a lesson of charity and humility is this! The other fact is a part of it; viz. the existence often of the warmest piety with the coldest creed;

the most cheerful and ardent zeal with the gloomiest faith ; a devotion and exertion that can never be surpassed, from those who believe that every thing is unalterably fixed, and each soul doomed or elected ; while those who hold the opposite, and make every thing hang upon the character and life, are perhaps asleep, inactive, indifferent, and immovable.

There is a truth here for *us* especially — a truth which we rejoice to own for others, and which we ask others to consider in our behalf. We rejoice in all we see, and there is much, of piety and zeal, of humility and love, and the noblest self-sacrifice, in many who differ from us most widely. In multitudes of the dead and the living, we discern the spirit of Christ, and the purity and peace of heaven. Happy beyond expression should we be, if all of our own church were equally engaged in life, and blessed in death. And yet from many of their doctrines we recoil, as from that which is not of God or Christ, truth or heaven. And they recoil from ours yet more. Do they admit as much? Do they believe that any, holding this which they call error, have been or can be so humble in spirit, so prayerful in habit, and in life faithful, that they may and must be saved? We ask not so much for the fact, as for the argument and inference. For if they do believe it of one single soul, if they would not sweep the millions, who have been and are of our faith, into hopeless destruction, they yield that which we ask as to the relation of doctrine to duty. And all they cannot sweep away. No, they *cannot*. There are those of our name in heaven, who forbid it. There are those on earth, and those passing from earth, who forbid it. They show the love of God written in their forehead, and it is read of all men. Few they may be from some points of view, few as they appear to the public gaze ; but there they are ; men of the highest aspiration and holiest devotion, of faith in God, and fidelity to Christ ; men whose presence has been purity, whose life a blessing ; men who have found in our despised faith an anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast unto the end. To connect with such men utter depravity, foul hypocrisy, final condemnation, and a black and burning hell, would not be possible for the worst bigot that ever knew them. There they are, gone and going ! What a band has been added to the company of the blessed above ! What a brotherhood can we

see now in the world of spirits, whom but a few years ago we saw and heard in the midst of us, our brothers, fathers, and helpers ! God forbid that we glory, save in his gift and goodness. But we may and will thank him, while we rejoice in their lives, or weep at their graves ; and as we speak, the grave is opening, and setting its seal to their fidelity.

But it was far from our plan or thought, to be personal, even in allusion, in this inquiry, or in any sense sectarian. We should aim at large principles, not partial views. Many principles we could deduce, even from the cursory and unfinished views now taken. The subject deserves a treatise, for it covers the whole field of religious controversy and essential truth.

One of the principles or positions which we have already reached, is this. It is not disputed doctrine, however important it may be deemed, that acts *most* on the character or life. The truths most agitated among Christians are not the most vital. If they were, we should see it in the corresponding results. On the contrary, we do see very different results where there is the same doctrine, and similar results with different and even opposite doctrines. We see good men in spite of the errors of their creed, and bad men with all creeds. It was a noble declaration which we lately heard from a venerable minister of the Baptist church, that men are made Christians by that in which they agree, more than by that in which they differ.

Another position, therefore, is, that there is a faith that affects the character, and reaches and regenerates the soul, more surely than any speculation, and apart from all exclusive doctrine. There is a faith of the heart, which is common to many systems, and may be shared by every lover of truth and duty. It is this that rules, this that unites, this that commends to God ; and not that about which the world is wrangling. There is an immense amount of truth, about which there is no wrangling among Christians. And this is the great and essential truth. In no other way can you account for the fact, that you find so much of the highest truth and good in every church. It is the common, but mighty truth of God's being and government, his providence and presence, and our strict accountableness. It is the mighty truth of Christ's divine mission, and the necessity of that holiness of heart and life, which he exhibited and required. Faith in these is better than all "the commandments of men."

And therefore it is, as another result, that so many of the doctrines of the church are negative and barren — because they are “the commandments of men.” It is not these that produce the piety and life which you revere; they exist often without them, and are not always found with them. It is not the want of these that prevents piety and the Christian life. It is the want of a true love of God, love of men, love of truth and of Christ. It is the want of a hearty faith in the power and the peril, the sin, accountableness, and immortality of the soul. “With the heart man believeth unto righteousness.” Give us the faith of the heart, let us see it working righteousness of life, and we will hail a friend of Jesus, and a laborer with God. “If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.”

Again, we meet the question which is sure to come, and ought to come; “Do you mean by all this that doctrines are immaterial, and all neutral?” By no means. Just the opposite. Those doctrines which are “the commandments of men,” are neutral, or worse. But there are doctrines which are of God, and these are essential; these we entreat you to learn, and learn on your single and solemn responsibility. Not less, but more attention would we call to doctrines, that they may be known, spiritually discerned, and tested by the life. For this we have taken the subject. There is too little thought of doctrine, at least with us; too little, with all, of “that doctrine which is according to godliness.” Too much importance can never be attached to the truth. And truth is doctrine; sound, essential, everlasting doctrine. Only confound it not with the human and the transient; and think not that you really *believe*, unless you find it is acting upon you. Whatever its name or outward relation, either it is not truth, or it is not believed, unless it moves the heart, and moulds the life. Find the doctrine which humbles and purifies, renews and quickens, fills with love to God and man, leads to Christ, and makes it the one thing needful, *to live as Christ lived* — then thank God, and go on your way rejoicing.

With these principles in mind, sustained by all we have offered, we may attempt to answer briefly the two questions

which have been suggested throughout. What is essential Doctrine? What is essential Duty?

What is essential Doctrine? This question each class of Christians will answer, at first thought, in favor of their own doctrine. Yet they will not say, none say, that their own doctrine only has ever saved a soul. All admit the probability, if not certainty, that with other doctrines men have sometimes led the Christian life, and been saved. Therefore they abandon the assumption, that their own views are absolutely essential. They contend for their own views, and may use language and measures, which intimate the positive necessity of embracing these views, in order to be saved. Still they shrink from the implied but awful inference, that all but themselves are to be lost forever. They accuse us of misrepresentation and calumny, if we impute to them any such declaration or opinion. And thus they yield the whole, so far as it concerns the essential. This is a vast concession. It is a grave matter, not sufficiently weighed. It throws light upon our whole inquiry, and we must stop a moment to illustrate it.

The Episcopalian believes in the apostolic succession. He holds scrupulously to the divine right of Bishops, denies the validity of any other ordination, and at least doubts the efficacy of all other administrations. Yet what Episcopalian believes, that none but those whom their Bishops ordain ever preach Christ, or that all who receive ordinances and services at other hands, all other protestant sects, perish everlastingly? The Baptist believes in immersion, as the only baptism into Christ, required of all who would be Christians and be saved. Yet what Baptist would say, that all souls, whose bodies have not been under the water, are doomed to eternal destruction? Does he, who adheres most rigidly to close communion on earth, expect or desire to find a similar communion in heaven, from which all Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Methodists, Catholics, are eternally excluded? No. Then the Baptist does not believe immersion to be essential. And the Episcopalian does not believe episcopacy to be essential.

Trinitarians generally insist that a belief in the trinity is essential. But what is the trinity? Which of the fifty different definitions and different doctrines is it, that is essential? Or is it only something and anything, that takes the name of trinity? Will either of the five different trinities, which Bishop

Stillingfleet has described, be sufficient? Is the Sabellian trinity as good as the Athanasian? Does Stuart in our own day hold as sound a trinity, as Sherlock did in his? If we believe in such a view as most trinitarians now give us, when we *talk* with them, shall we be accepted? Will the most sincere and pious Trinitarians say, that the millions who have believed in the simple undivided unity of God, from the first century to the present, have miserably perished, and all who shall ever take the same faith will die the same eternal death? No. Then the trinity is not essential.

Protestants generally condemn Popery, as antichrist. They give it even worse names, than any which they apply to the worst forms of protestant error. But none of them would say that there never was a pious Catholic, or that out of that vast community, so much larger than all the rest of christendom, there are not multitudes who are forgiven and saved. So even reversing the position. Papists all condemn the Protestant. But when you talk with them, you do not find an intelligent member of the whole Catholic church, who will say that no Protestant ever has been or ever can be saved. Where then is the essential doctrine?

Clearly, by the confession of all, it is not any one doctrine that can be named, or any system that can be defined, which men soberly believe to be the exclusive condition and only ground of salvation. There is not one doctrine or system, which some have not held, and yet been false and lost. There is not one doctrine or system, which some have not lived without, and yet been pious and accepted. And the simple reason is, not that systems are all bad, or doctrines ever unimportant, but that systems are human, and doctrines interpreted by fallible men. For observe, it is not the doctrine merely, which different Christians present as essential, but *their interpretation* of the doctrine; and this is always human and fallible. This shows the chief separation between us, as Unitarians, and most others. It is not the doctrine of Christ's divinity, that we pronounce untrue or unessential, but their interpretation of it; not regeneration, not conversion, not the atonement, that we reject, but only their view of them; a difference as palpable and wide, as that between divine truth and human error. And this men will see, this all humble believers do feel, when they come to the practical application of their essential doctrines, in view of all souls and everlasting life.

But is there no essential doctrine? Yes. There is a foundation on which every man must build. The stone, which was set at nought by the builders, has become the head of the corner. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." All Christians will say, CHRIST. And with our whole hearts we respond, CHRIST. And now we ask, of what are you thinking, when you repeat that name, and set it forth as the great essential? Are you thinking of a doctrine? And what doctrine? "The doctrine of the Cross," would be the general orthodox answer. And one more truly orthodox and just cannot be given, in few words. But what is the doctrine of the Cross? This; that Christ died to save us, and that if we believe and follow him, we shall be saved; not otherwise. *If we believe and follow CHRIST.* It must come to this. The doctrine of life is the spirit of obedience. "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his."

There is another view of essential doctrine. It is essential that we find and hold all of truth that we possibly can. It is a small thing, to seek only so much truth as may keep us from condemnation. It is a low view of God and Christ, of duty and salvation, to ask how much we must believe, or what we must say and do, to save ourselves from hell. The great salvation is deliverance from SIN. No doctrine or life is of much worth, that does not keep us from sin. And no one can doubt, that some doctrines do deter from sin, more than others. Though it be true, that no system contains all truth, some systems contain more truth than others, and therefore will possess more moral efficacy, exert more saving power. Some doctrines, that may not lead us away from Christ, may yet fail to bring us to Christ. Some, that exalt him most in words, may create least of his spirit and life. Those are best, and may with most reason be called essential, which do most to purify the heart, to make the spirit meek, and the life useful and holy.

Let us look a moment at the doctrine of Atonement in this connection; as that, more than any other perhaps, is now deemed essential, and supposed to have the best influence of all. What is it, that is thus regarded, under this name? The name itself, the word "atonement," was never used by Christ, nor more than once is it found in the New Testament.

And then there are as many different definitions of the atonement, as of the trinity. The modern doctrine is so distinct from the ancient, that none will bear now the imputation of that which was once pronounced essential. To say then that you believe in the atonement, is to say nothing definite. We all say that. We believe in the atonement, cordially and religiously. And if any tell us, 'it is idle and a mockery in you to say so, for if you believe it at all, it is only in your own way,' we reply, 'it is only in *your* way that you believe in it.' We could add, as our firm belief, 'it is not in the scriptural way.' Trinitarians and Calvinists do not believe in the true atonement, as we read the Bible. For the doctrine there is Reconciliation, the reconciliation of man to God. But the atonement of Calvinism is one that means and requires the reconciliation of God to man. These are directly opposed, and cannot both stand. Paul says, "Christ gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Calvin and most trinitarians virtually say, — Christ gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from the wrath or justice of God, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, *suspicious* of good works. The apostle writes, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." The Calvinist insists, that 'God was in Christ reconciling himself to the world.' Can both be true? We say not; and we say also, that that which is not true cannot be salutary, and is in no sense essential. At the same time, we see that there is that in the doctrine of atonement, which is true and momentous; namely, that man must be reconciled to God; and that if the life and death of Christ do not reconcile and subdue him, he is in awful peril. This we all believe. This is essential doctrine, and there is none greater, none more solemn, than this; that "Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners," and that if sinners are not saved, if they are not redeemed from all *iniquity*, they are lost. Is it essential, that we believe anything as to the *mode* in which this redemption is wrought? No. But it is essential that we believe in the Fact, and the Duty it involves; believe that "the blood of Christ" answers the end for which it was shed, when it "cleanses from all sin," and only then.

The Duty. We have left little space for this, but we must answer the question, what is the essential Duty? And we

must answer, in general terms, hoping to say more hereafter. Duty pertains to everything. It pertains to all work, and all thought also. It pertains not least to doctrine, for doctrine involves truth ; and no man can know or do his duty, who does not know or seek the truth. No man does his duty, or can do it, until he has looked into the truths of religion, for these affect all his relations to God, man, and his own destiny ; — and these are doctrines. No man does his duty, who goes not to the highest sources of truth, in prayer, in study, in independent inquiry, and impartial, humble temper. No man reaches the essential duty, who becomes passively, by mere descent, custom, or fashion, a member of any sect or communion, Catholic, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Quaker, or Unitarian, even if the system into which he thus inertly falls be the true and best. It is not enough to be *attached* to any form of truth, the most orthodox, the most saving. That truth must be voluntarily sought, prayerfully studied, thoroughly imbibed, or it will not be truth to that mind, and cannot have the power of salvation.

The essential duty then is, to seek all truth, and make it a part of the individual mind, a part and principle of all *life*. But do not think that duty refers only to life. We like not the talk of some of our people, about the sufficiency of living well ; as if they could live well, if they do not live to God, or could live to God, if they study not or follow not his word in Christ. We like not the way of some preachers, in keeping wholly to the practical, exclusive of the doctrinal ; as if the doctrinal were not to be learned and well pondered, before the practical can be wholly or rightly performed. It is a flagrant evil, that any people, calling themselves Christians, do not feel it an imperious duty to learn what Christianity is, in all its parts, and be able to explain and defend their view of it. To be ignorant of religion, to have no settled opinions, no established and treasured doctrines, is dishonorable and dangerous. There is a knowledge that is *essential* to strength of conviction and soundness of faith. There is a doctrinal duty, as well as a practical duty. Men must have, they will have, some doctrines ; and woe unto them, if they be not the doctrines of truth. If religion does not lie in opinions or forms, neither does it lie in the decencies and moralities of life. Why confine it to either ? How clear, that religion, obligation, duty, comprises *all* we can do for the good of man, for

the truth of Christ, for the salvation of souls, and thus for the glory of God.

Does it all point to anything, so much as to the spirit, and the spiritual life? Has religion such essential connection with any words, forms, doctrines, or set of duties, as with the habitual frame in the sight of God, controlling the habitual walk among men, that is, the Heart, the inward and outward Life, the whole Character, the living Soul?

E. B. H.

THE LATE REV. PROFESSOR WARE.

THE following are extracts from a discourse, preached in the Chapel of the University at Cambridge, and in the New North Church, in Boston, on the Sunday immediately following the death of the Rev. Professor Ware, Jun.

The preacher having spoken of the happiness of those, "over whom the second death shall have no power," and of the distinguished honor conferred on those, who, by their labors and their lives, "have turned many to righteousness," thus adverted to the bereavements, to which our churches and religious community had recently been called.

Let us rejoice, my brethren, and give thanks to God for our assurance of faith, that such is the destiny, nay, such, we will rather trust, is already the happiness of those, our honored friends and brethren, who within a few revolving months have in rapid succession been taken from among us. Within a very short period, the ravages of death, especially in the ranks of the clergy, have been alike frequent and signal. A year is but just now completed, since we were called with this community, and all the lovers of truth and goodness throughout the land to mourn, that a light of unusual lustre had been withdrawn;* and that lips, that could plead with surpassing eloquence for God and man, were silenced in the

* Rev. William Ellery Channing, D. D., who died Oct. 2, 1842.

grave. A kindred spirit, partaker of his gifts, and unto him as a brother,* who in another calling united the finest conceptions of genius and the most exquisite productions of art, with an humble piety that sanctified them both, soon followed him to the heavenly rest. By a providence no less sudden, the respected Pastor of a neighboring church† was surprised in the walks of public instruction by the summons of death, even while uttering the words of life, and honoring by his just eulogium the memory of a friend, whose remains he had but just committed to the tomb. Yet, more recently, another honored servant of God, who by his gifts and his life had adorned his profession, whose name will never cease to be revered by them to whom he ministered, and who will live in his works long after his wasted form shall have mingled with its parent dust, slept sweetly in Jesus.‡ And now, even with others, whose names and whose virtues will at once occur to your remembrance, we have been called within a few passing days to commit to their resting place, the remains of one long honored among us, whose voice was always welcomed in our churches, whose gifts were consecrated in no common measure to the highest objects, and who has left behind him a memory that cannot perish.

It is not needful that I should delineate here the character of one already so well known. The form, the voice, enfeebled at last by disease, the gifts and virtues, that no disease impairs, of my departed brother, are already familiar here. You need not, that I should remind you of his distinguished worth. Rather let us mingle together, my brethren, our mutual recollections, and seek the instructions, which in his departure from among us we all must need.

It is chiefly in his relations to our University, and to the church of Christ; as a minister of religion, and a teacher in the school of the Prophets, that I would speak of our departed friend. But with these, his official, were inseparably united those personal graces, which gave to his character as a man, its attraction, its beauty, and usefulness.

For the Christian ministry he was peculiarly fitted, by his

* Washington Allston, Esq.

† Rev. David Damon, Minister of a church in West Cambridge.

‡ Rev. F. W. P. Greenwood, D. D.

early and decided predilections, for it was the choice of his childhood ; by the felicity of his domestic education in the beautiful village of his birth ; by the examples it was there his favored lot to witness ; by all the habits of his mind, and especially by his youthful piety. Even as was the seer of Israel, Henry Ware was consecrate from his youth. Having received the honors of the University in 1812, and having been engaged for a season in the instruction of youth, chiefly in the Academy of Exeter, he completed his course of theological preparation, and entered upon his public labors as a preacher in 1816. Upon the death of the venerable Dr. Lathrop, he was ordained on the first day of the following year, (1817,) as Pastor of the Second Church in Boston.

Of his earliest labors in the sacred desk it may perhaps be said, that they gave only imperfect indications, either of the ability or success by which he was afterwards distinguished. It was rather with a calm approbation than with raptures of enthusiasm that he was at first received. He was not exposed to the trial, neither did he experience the humiliation, which not seldom follows a premature popularity. It was not till a few years had passed, that his people, and with them the community, understood the full power and excellence of the spirit that was in him. The fact is not without its use, and I advert to it for the purpose, as it is fruitful of encouragement to those, who perhaps with inferior gifts, are either contemplating, or have already entered upon the same calling. For never were there happier results to beginnings so healthful, because unmingled with idolatrous applause. A feeble church was strengthened ; a little one became a thousand. The young flocked to his ministry. The aged, who called him, dwelt on his lips with fondness, and witnessed with a parental joy the good fruits of his labors. Few ministries have been more signally blessed. His influence was not confined to his peculiar flock, but was gradually diffused through the whole community. And how many minds have by his teachings been enlightened ; how many hearts have been allured to goodness ; how many have been turned from sin to righteousness ; how many sorrowing spirits have by his consolations been sustained ; in fine, how many immortal souls have been won to Christ and heaven — are known as yet only to Him, who is the witness and the re-

warder of all. "But they shall be known," saith God, "in the day when I make up my jewels."

Dr. Ware commenced his ministry at a period of more than usual excitement, and of advancing changes in our churches. The sources of these changes, on which I need not enlarge, were unquestionably of earlier origin, but the effects then became manifest. I have said, that his first public services did not give presage of his future eminence. But upon the publication of his historical discourses, preached in May, 1821, on the completion of a century from the establishment of his church, it was evident what hopes might be entertained concerning him. From that period may be dated the prominent place, which he ever afterwards sustained in the varied relations of his profession, with his brethren, his flock, and the Christian community. His mind, active almost to restlessness, was fruitful of suggestions, which he readily matured into plans, for the moral and spiritual improvement of all whom he could influence; and the measures he was earnest to propose, he was not less zealous and determined to pursue. The various projects of a literary, philanthropic, or religious nature, which then first engaged the attention of the community, the associations for the promotion of Peace, of Temperance, for the relief of Poverty, for the religious instruction of the Poor, for the wider diffusion of our faith, most of which were in their origin coeval with his ministry, and have since become identified with the character of the times, met his hearty concurrence, and failed not of his effectual help.* His unceasing activity of mind, united with singular facility of execution, tempted him, however, to efforts beyond his strength. There was that within him, which consumed him. And much as we may admire the disinterestedness of his zeal, it is impossible for us, now that his labors have ceased, and his precious life has closed, not to lament that in the fervors of the spiritual, he was tempted to forget what the Maker of our frames has ordained, and none may with impunity violate, for

* To the religious and literary journals of the day his contributions were frequent and valuable. Of the *Christian Disciple* he was for a considerable period the faithful editor; and in the *Christian Examiner*, which succeeded it, some of its most valuable articles were the productions of his pen. His publications, chiefly of a professional nature, were numerous. An accurate list of these, found among his papers, may be seen in the appendix to the interesting discourse delivered on the Sunday after his death, by Rev. Chandler Robbins, Dr. Ware's successor in the Second Church.

the welfare of the physical being. In this, let him be to us rather for monition than example.

If we seek for the causes of the distinguished success of his ministry, one certainly of the most efficient will be found in the *earnestness*, combined with the humility of his spirit. The union of these graces was in him a distinguishing trait. His earnestness was singularly tranquil. It was a wise and chastened earnestness. It did not exhaust itself in a single peculiar cause, or upon an exclusive object. It was a zeal chastened by humility; by a just appreciation of the objects that interested others, while it was intent on those he had selected for his own. He loved his profession — the true secret of success. He loved the scenes of its appropriate duties — the pulpit and the dwellings of the flock; and, as is recorded in praise of a devout monarch of Israel, “Whatsoever he did for the House of the Lord, he did it with his whole heart, and it prospered.” The people saw it, and they trusted him.

And here I cannot but remark — it is forced upon my notice by the aspects, shall I say, the lowering aspects of the times — that in this devotion to his sacred calling, in union with his distinguished success, Dr. Ware has bequeathed an example, worthy to be imitated alike by the elder and the younger of his brethren. If we of the clergy would maintain the due influence, I do not say of *our* ministry, but of the religion for which the ministry was ordained; if amidst theories and speculations, that would exalt the little devices of man above the ordinances, and even the truth of God, we would speak that word with power, we must *give ourselves*, as the apostle writes, to that ministry; nor substitute any mistaken schemes of our own, under a delusive plea of duty or conscience, (names so often abused to justify fatal errors,) for the glorious gospel of the blessed God.

In his relations to the University, and as a teacher in our school of the Prophets, they who were the objects of his instructions, and they who were his fellow-laborers in that chosen work, the witnesses of his fidelity and zeal, are better qualified to bear testimony than am I. The successive generations of those, who were taught by his meek wisdom, and have gone from those hallowed scenes of their preparation with the rich blessing of his friendship and prayers, will re-

member gratefully how they have received, how they did reap of the fruit of his lips, and were allured to holiness by the sanctity of his life.

If amidst varied and burdensome duties, in part from the habits of his mind, and yet more from the pressure, — but too frequent, — of bodily infirmity, there was sometimes less exactness or fulness in his instructions, than might have been sought, there was still that which is better than all method or the most exact philosophy, — the true spirit of wisdom, the best results of learning, even of the wisdom that cometh from above, an unaffected piety and hearty charity, a pure and holy zeal. Such was the confidence he inspired in the integrity of his heart, in the sincerity of his friendship, and in the devotedness of his spirit, that, I believe, no student ever departed from his care, without a sentiment of veneration and even of filial love.

In truth, it was the peculiar felicity of our friend adequately to be appreciated only by those, whose vocation involves continual public efforts, that if, on any single or peculiar occasion, he might seem to fail, as others fail, of his accustomed excellence, or of the high standard, that alone could satisfy himself, he never failed of a respectful, I had almost said, a reverent attention, or, of what to his disinterested view was far more to be valued, an useful impression. Men waited for his words, and knowing the purity of the spirit that breathed them, they suffered no one of them to fall to the ground. The gift of his instructions might not at all times be alike costly, but it was offered from a holy altar; and “the altar sanctified the gift.”

In intimate connexion with this, let me speak of the simplicity of his character, rejecting all artifice, impatient of the slightest affectation or pretence, combined with manners plain and unobtrusive; and by those who knew not the inward warmth of his affections, liable to be mistaken for coldness, or for inattention to the courtesies of polished life. He could not be regarded as eminently social. Though his affections were kind and he loved his friends, he could live and act alone. His chosen employments and satisfactions were in his study, or within his domestic circle. But in the singleness of his character and absolute truthfulness, that would never express more than was felt, was the essential element of his power.

In this, as in some other traits, we recognise a near resemblance between him and our other lamented brother, to whom Dr. Ware was allied in intimate friendship, and whom within so brief an interval he followed to the tomb. There was indeed some remarkable correspondence, not less in the trials of their lot, than in the graces of their character. Who, that knew him, could fail to recognise in the lamented Greenwood the same simplicity and godly sincerity; the same dislike even to hatred of all guile; the same integrity of heart and conduct; the same reverence of God and the great things of God's law; the same love of his calling, and quiet and efficient devotion to its duties? And who, too, that knew them both, could but lament, that spirits touched to such issues were lodged in such feeble frames? Brothers they were in faith and in one hope of their calling. Brothers, also, they were in the trial of infirmity. The strength of each it pleased God to weaken in his way. Each was called, even at a youthful age, but amidst threatening disease, to resign the charge of a cherished flock. Each was compelled to seek among strangers, whom they quickly changed to friends, and in distant climes, where God himself made for them an home, the strength that failed them in their native land. To each were months and even years of sickness appointed; and now at their meridian age, and within the interval of a few short weeks, do they both lie down together in the "caverned earth." "Lovely were they and pleasant in their lives: and in death they were not divided."

If among the appointments of a perfect Providence there be any that in our imperfect vision we may call mysterious; for which even faith itself and an unshaken trust seek to be resolved, we surely must number those, by which the gifted and the good are taken away; holy purposes are broken off; and they, who could speak and live for God and their fellow-men, are silenced in death. But blessed be God, they do not die. The sickness that wastes the body quenches not the spiritual life. There is a beautiful compensation, too, in such appointments of God, worthy of our grateful contemplation. Through the sympathy that infirmity awakens; through the peculiar virtues that sickness cherishes; through the added tenderness and spirituality it conveys to the inward spirit; through the touching tones it conveys to the voice, the gifted and submissive sufferer not seldom exerts a power

surpassing far his influence in health. "Are you aware," said one in speaking of the ravages of sickness in a friend whose lips were touched of heaven, "are you aware how consumption tunes the voice, and by its deeper and more touching tones makes it mighty to persuade?"

It was beautiful to perceive, — for it revealed to us the unchangeable power of goodness which not pain nor death can impair, — how the influence of our departed friend remained long after his active labors had ceased; how effectually he spoke from the chamber of sickness, or the domestic abode, in the silent influence of example, long after he had ceased from the pulpit of instruction and the house of prayer. And now, united with others that have gone before, is he before the throne of God, serving him in his temple. Now are they priests unto God and to Christ. And though eye hath not seen, and heart cannot conceive the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him; and though we would give indulgence to no delusive fancies in regard to the employments and felicity of the spiritual world, yet may we not believe, that for such, a blessed ministry is appointed, — a ministry of celestial charity and love, — as well as an unspeakable happiness prepared? If they delighted in doing good on earth, they shall not want the opportunity of doing good in heaven. For are they not, asks the Apostle, "ministering spirits sent forth to minister," — who knows but in other worlds, — "to them who shall be heirs of salvation?" And there being set free from all the infirmities of earth, while they behold God's face in glory, all their desires and all their pure ambition shall be forever satisfied.

Amidst our deep regrets for the departure of these our cherished and honored friends, we should be faithless indeed to our best convictions and hopes, did we not remember, that it is well with them; that they have exchanged infirmity and pain, and a world out of which we must die, for a world in which there is no death and no change but from glory to glory. Let it please the God, who hath chastened us, to make this our bereavement the ministry of instruction and peace to our souls. May it be richly blest, not only to them, who shared his domestic affections, and to whom he was inexpressibly dear; not only to the venerable parent, called in his declining years to mourn the loss of such a son, and who will not fail, amidst natural grief, gratefully to

remember the peculiar honor and happiness conferred upon his house, in ministries transferred even to the third generation, and in spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus ; but may it be sanctified to the University, who cherished him in his youth as among her favorite sons, and honored him in his manhood as a faithful guide ; to the school of the Prophets, which he instructed by his wisdom, and blest by the sanctity of his life ; to the successive generations of the sons of the Prophets, who have gone forth from these hallowed scenes laden with the treasures of his experience, and the blessing of his intercession ; to that church of Christ that was the peculiar object of his pastoral care, to which with holy hands he did dispense the bread of life ; to all the churches of the Lord Jesus partaking of a common faith, who have heard the word from his lips, or were gladdened by his ministrations ; to all of us, his friends and brethren, who rejoiced in his light, and shared his fraternal love. And while we cherish the same sustaining faith, which he uttered even with his dying lips, " that the church below is one with the church above," and that death itself cannot divide them ; while we treasure up in our memories the sacred legacy he hath bequeathed us of his peace and love,* let us seek, each in our several vocations, to imitate his virtues. May we be quickened, by the monitions of successive bereavements, to " work the work of Him that sent us while it is day," that so we may be numbered with them over whom " the second death hath no power," with them who, having faithfully served their Master upon earth, shall shine as the stars forever and ever.

F. P.

* To a clerical friend, who visited him at Framingham, a few days before his death, he expressed, though amidst extreme weakness, the sentiment quoted above, and as he bade him farewell, said, " Peace and love to the brethren."

NOTICES OF MR. WHEELER.

It is not the circle of the ministry alone which, during the past year, has sustained great and irreparable losses. Literature also has been called to mourn over the premature departure of several of her most promising sons. Cleveland, Wheeler, and Bartlett, kindred spirits in their devotion to learning, and exemplary in the virtues of the Christian life, the two last preparing themselves for the work of the ministry, have within a few months, by violent and sudden disease, been consigned to the grave. They have been taken away almost in their youth, before they had more than just entered upon the labors that would so certainly have distinguished them, but happily, not before they had given the most satisfying evidence, that religion had found a deep and sure place in their hearts, had wrought there its proper work, and prepared them in their principles, habits, and affections, for the higher life to which, we humbly trust, they have ascended.

Of Mr. Wheeler, we are happy to be able to present a biographical sketch by his instructor and friend, Professor Felton. We have been permitted to transfer it to our pages from the *Boston Daily Advertiser*, where it appeared immediately after the news was received of the decease of Mr. Wheeler. To this we also add an extract from a "Biographical Notice," by a classmate, which has been published in a separate pamphlet.

The death of Mr. Charles Stearns Wheeler is not only a great loss to his family and his personal friends, but to this community. His career, though short, was an unbroken progress in honorable pursuits and not undistinguished labors. His last illness overtook him in a foreign land, in the midst of various and active studies, and large and liberal preparations for a life of letters and professional duties.

Mr. Wheeler belonged to a family of independent New England farmers. The bracing toils and invigorating breezes of country life, in which his early youth was passed, had knit his frame with health and strength. When he entered college,

at the age of sixteen, his face and figure showed that he possessed the hardihood to grapple like a man with the work that lay before him. He took the degree of Bachelor of Arts at the Cambridge University in 1837, among the foremost in a class of more than the usual proportion of able and studious young men. His time had been conscientiously employed upon the appropriate duties of the place. When he was graduated, he had mastered, besides the common course of college studies, several of the modern languages, and had acquired, for his age, an extensive knowledge of general literature.

After taking the first degree, Mr. Wheeler engaged in teaching a private school in the town of Cambridge. In this occupation, his genial character, his amiable temper, his ready sympathies, and his faithful industry gave him signal success. The intellectual and moral influences he exercised upon his pupils were salutary and profound; and his relinquishment of this occupation caused no little regret to the parents and friends of those who had been placed under his care. In 1838, the Greek Tutorship in the University becoming vacant, Mr. Wheeler was appointed to that office. He entered at once upon its duties, and devoted himself with his accustomed energy to all the studies embraced within the range of his department. It is but an act of simple justice, to say, that he not only prepared himself for his new occupations, with laborious and conscientious care, but that his labors were crowned with uncommon success. In his mode of instruction he combined the characters of teacher and friend; maintaining order, with no repulsive austerity, and exhibiting great frankness and simplicity of manners, without losing the controlling influence which naturally belonged to his talents, his position, and his learning. The matter of his instruction was varied and exact. He united to great precision, in teaching the elements and grammatical principles of the Greek language, that enlarged knowledge of collateral and illustrative subjects — of history, the arts, the political character and condition of antiquity, which add the living interest of human destinies, pursuits, and passions, to the study of what are called the dead languages. By this happy union of various and contrasted excellencies, he rendered his instruction at once useful and interesting.

In the discharge of his duties within the college walls, Mr. Wheeler was vigilant and efficient. No desire of popularity unnerved his vigor, when called upon to administer the neces-

sary but often disagreeable acts of discipline which pertained to his office. He never shrunk through fear of personal consequences from the exact performance of duties, which often brought him into the relation of a censor upon the conduct of the students. The annoyances which students, irritated by the rebukes of a conscientious disciplinarian, are capable of inflicting, and which sometimes make the life of a college officer uneasy and undesirable, had no power to deter him from acting up to his own sense of what his position in the University required at his hands. All those, who were connected with him, whether as pupils or associates, must now look back upon this part of his conduct with approbation and respect.

Mr. Wheeler continued in the office of Greek Tutor, four years; and when the department of history was organized under its present distinguished head, in addition to all his other duties, he undertook the instruction of the two younger classes in this branch. He carried into this new career of labor the same comprehensive spirit and searching industry, which had given him remarkable success elsewhere. Not contenting himself with mastering the contents of the text books he was called upon to teach, he studied deeply the history of the period over which his instructions extended, consulting the best authors of different ages and nations, and communicating to his classes the results of his inquiries by familiar lectures, enlarging, explaining, illustrating, or qualifying the statements contained in the manuals, which the students were required to read.

The want of a good edition of Herodotus, some portion of whose writings is usually read in college, led Mr. Wheeler to form the plan of editing this great historian. His labors upon this author, during several years of instruction, had already in part qualified him for this task. Having laid out his scheme, he at once set about executing it with his accustomed thoroughness and despatch. He collected the principal editions of his author, went through an extensive study of the commentators, brought together all the illustrations of modern travellers, geographers, and antiquaries, compared these with each other, corrected the errors of some by the more exact researches of others, and thus drew up a body of notes, which are entitled to great praise for their comprehensiveness, condensation, neatness, and accuracy. This excellent and learned work was published in 1842; it met with a most favorable reception, and has been already adopted in the principal colleges of the United States. Foreign scholars have also noticed it with applause.

To complete the picture of Mr. Wheeler's industry, it should be mentioned, that amidst this multiplicity of occupations, he found time to study a course of theology, which he completed before leaving the University. He was licensed to preach, and the discourse which he read on that occasion is said to have been a performance of remarkable merit.

At the close of the Academic year of 1842, Mr. Wheeler, to the regret of his associates, resigned his place in the College, for the purpose of carrying into effect a cherished plan of travel and study, for which he had long been making preparations. By five years of industry and economy, he had provided ample pecuniary means for executing this scheme in a manner becoming a scholar and a gentleman. When his resignation was known to the members of the University, the class, that had been the last year under his special instruction, manifested their attachment to him, and their sense of his services and of his character, by transmitting to him, through the hands of one of their number, a beautiful and costly present. — The manner in which he was affected by this proof of regard is best seen in the following letter, which deserves to be perpetuated for the beauty and simplicity of its expression, the tenderness of feeling and the purity of purpose breathing through every line.

Cambridge, July 15, 1842.

DEAR SIR: — My surprise and emotion, when you put into my hands the presents of your Class, allowed me only so imperfect and indistinct an expression of my thanks, that you must excuse me if I trouble you upon the subject.

Allow me then through you to say, to "the Class of 1845," that I am deeply sensible of their kindness and generosity; that no tokens of their regard could have been more delicately chosen, and more welcome; and that long years (if indeed such a time ever be) must pass, and I become another man, before I can look upon them as common things, or use them without recalling the faces of those who gave them, and the hours which their indulgence has made happy ones.

The past year has been one of unprecedented calamity to me, as respects my family relations. A brother, and an only sister, to the labor of whose hands I owe in part the advantages of a College education, have been called away from this troubled life; and my own existence made sad by a sense of being almost alone in the world, and by sympathy with a desolated household. It has been to me in my seasons of trouble a source of no slight

enjoyment, that in many countenances I could read the plainest signs of sympathy, and that you all have been so careful to refrain from everything which could have grated harshly upon my feelings.

You will allow me to add, that valuable as your presents intrinsically are, I shall prize them chiefly as the proofs of your affection to me. You have done me a great service in this simple act of kindness. You have given me a confidence in myself, which some of the events of previous years had well nigh destroyed, and which was essential to my success and usefulness in life; and for this above all things, though you may not have thought of it, my warmest thanks are due.

I part from you with the earnest hope that I may be permitted to do something, at some future time, for individuals of your number, if not for the whole class, to make you aware of my sense of obligation. In this, however, I may fail; but I shall not fail to hear with pleasure that you are happy and successful; that you are good, and that you do good.

My relations with you have been, and I hope ever will be, sources of real happiness. You will find among those, who are to be your teachers, men wiser and better than he who now bids you farewell; but no one who will retain more pleasant recollections of you each and all.

I could say much more to you from my inmost heart, but I will stop here. I only add my prayer that you may, while in this world, live above its meannesses and sins, and in the perfect enjoyment of all its loveliness and beauty; that from every social relation you may extract the sweet without the bitter; and that you may one and all while here grow up into such vital connexion with the eternal laws of beauty, truth, and goodness, as shall be the pledge and the realization of immortality.

I am most truly and sincerely your friend and servant,

C. S. WHEELER.

It must always be a grateful reflection to the generous and high-minded young men, who made this graceful acknowledgment of the virtues and excellencies of their departed instructor, that they have thus cheered a gentle spirit, which, serene as it ever appeared, had yet been deeply wounded by the loss of near relatives, and by many painful crosses which he had been called upon to bear, during the last year or two of his life.

Having completed his arrangements, Mr. Wheeler embarked in one of the New York packets for Havre, in August, 1842, and after a pleasant voyage, reached that port, Sep-

tember 3d. He commenced his journey into Germany at once, and without stopping to visit Paris, travelled through Belgium, and up the Rhine to Heidelberg, which he intended as his first residence. His letters show that he made the best possible use of the brief delays, which the rapidity of his journey allowed him in the principal cities, such as Antwerp, Brussels, Aix la Chapelle, and Cologne. They abound in minute observations of the country, the people, the buildings, and all those objects of art and nature which would naturally attract the attention of an inquisitive and cultivated American traveller. Not a moment was lost; not an object, that came within the range of his observation, was unheeded. He reached Heidelberg, Sept. 24, where he immediately entered upon the course of study he had marked out for himself. He had already mastered the difficulties of the German language, before leaving the United States; and in a short time he was able to attend the lectures of the professors, and to mingle in the society of the place with pleasure and profit. The letters of introduction, with which he was furnished, secured to him the kind attentions of the most distinguished persons in that seat of learning; and his own simple manners, intelligent conversation, and earnest desire of knowledge rapidly enlarged the range of his acquaintance far beyond the academic circles. Mr. Mittermayer, one of the greatest names in the literature of Germany, says in a letter, "Mr. Wheeler frequents my house. He is a very distinguished man, animated with great zeal for science, and his manners show him to be a man of education. — He has made great progress in the German, and I suppose that he will in a few months be able to speak it fluently. I will certainly look for every opportunity to be of use to him." He heard the lectures of the principal professors; of Schlosser, on History; of Ullmann, on Ecclesiastical History; and of Baehr, the learned editor of Herodotus, and the head of the Philological Seminary, the exercises of which he constantly attended, besides the lectures of many others on various branches of literature. In addition to this, he had, under the advice of Professor Baehr, begun the collation of one of the orations of Lysias in Greek, with the oldest existing manuscript. He had also commenced the translation of a work on Roman History, from the German. What progress he made in these two undertakings is not yet known. These occupations, and a variety of other private studies, joined to much intercourse with the society, both of Heidelberg and the neighboring ducal

residence of Manheim, filled up his time, laboriously but delightfully, until about the 1st of March, 1843, when he left Heidelberg for Goettingen. Here he remained a month, attending lectures, and forming acquaintances with the distinguished men connected with the University — enlarging his knowledge in every direction, and gaining the friendship of all with whom he came in contact. Early in April, he left Goettingen in company with a friend and countryman; visited Weimar and Jena, and then went to Leipsic, where he was seized with illness about the first of May. This illness soon took the form of a violent gastric fever, which defied the best medical skill Leipsic afforded, and, after six weeks of suffering, closed his life on the 13th of June, at the age of twenty-six. Mr. Heath, the young friend just alluded to, attended him with affectionate assiduity during this long and terrible illness, and was by his bedside when he died. With this exception, his last days were passed wholly among strangers, more than three thousand miles from his native land.

I have thus drawn a rapid sketch of the literary life of Charles Stearns Wheeler. His character combined an assemblage of virtues, talents, and excellencies, which gave the amplest promise of future distinction. The constitution of his mind was calm, serene, gentle. During an acquaintance of many years, I have never seen his temper ruffled for a moment, even in the most irritating circumstances; and the testimony of those who have known him from childhood is to the same effect. His handsome and healthful countenance, ever open, cheerful, and smiling, well expressed the beauty of his soul. His manners were frank and honest, like those of a good-humored child. There was no disguise, no concealment, no intrigue, no suppression of thought or purpose in his transparent nature. His mind, though not brilliant, was large, capacious, and strong. His powers, taken singly, were of uncommon vigor; and combined and balanced as they were, formed an intellect singularly adapted to grapple with a great variety of literary and scientific pursuits. His curiosity was intense; and his sympathies, intellectual and moral, embraced every form of speculation and every variety of character. He was sometimes too much absorbed with the whimsical novelties which the agitations of the age have brought to the surface of the foaming sea of philosophical and religious discussion. But there lay, at the foundation of

his intellectual and moral being, a strength of common sense, which remained unshaken by the sophistries of the age, against which minds of less solidity have been unable to stand. His clear intellectual vision saw the good in the ethical and religious theories that, with kaleidoscopic rapidity, have appeared, dazzled, and vanished during the last few years; and the purity of his moral nature rejected, without an effort, the baneful elements which have been blended with them.

Mr. Wheeler had an extraordinary self-control. All the sensual propensities were held in strict subordination to his higher nature. He never sought in the violence of youthful passions an excuse for youthful excesses. During the perilous years of college life, when the young man is released from the moral restraints of home, when the peculiar clannish spirit of the place, and the codes of college honor, take away to a certain extent the controlling influences of public opinion, of society, and of law, and when many are hurried into acts of violence, or intemperate indulgences, which they think venial at the time, but look back upon with regret if not with remorse, Wheeler kept himself pure and unspotted. No appetite enslaved him; no excesses weakened his mental powers; no time was lost in recovering from the effects of untimely festivities. And so every day found his intellectual faculties alert, calm, and prepared to turn each passing moment to the best account. He possessed the rare talent of using his time well. The smallest fragment of leisure was devoted to its appropriate object; moments that most persons waste, because they are *only* moments, he made precious by doing or acquiring. This uninterrupted command of his powers, this prompt application of the smallest intervals of time, explain the secret of his comprehensive and exact scholarship, acquired in the midst of duties and labors, that might be supposed sufficient to occupy all of his time, and to exhaust his energies. At the period of his death, his knowledge was rapidly increasing, and his powers were unfolding under the generous culture which he was bestowing upon them. Classical literature, history, philosophy, and theology shared his attention by turns. His learning in these departments was consolidating and systematising itself; clear and distinct views were forming in his mind; and he was rapidly fitting himself to become a teacher in the highest sense of the word; to contribute to the literature and science

of the country, and to adorn her intellectual annals. No young man has left the University for many years, who gave brighter promise of usefulness and distinction ; no man has died at his early age, who has crowded into his short life more of honorable toil. His family and friends may well console themselves by the reflection, that though suddenly called to die, the call found him with no duty unperformed, no task neglected, no opportunity of mental or moral culture thrown away.

The few pages which follow are from the "Biographical Notice" above mentioned. After reverting to the principal incidents in Mr. Wheeler's life, the writer proceeds, —

We come now to another important occupation of Mr. Wheeler, during the years of his tutorship at Harvard. Previous to his graduation in 1837, he had determined to devote himself to the ministry, and this determination was never in his subsequent life left out of mind. Having devoted a portion of his time to the requisite studies, he was approbated to preach but a few weeks previous to his departure, and had for a few times, assumed the duties of his profession in supplying the pulpits of his clerical friends. He was never connected as a student, with the Divinity School at Cambridge, though he was an attendant at certain of its lectures and other exercises. His idea of the duties of his office was enlarged and exalted. Conscious of the narrowing influence of certain of the pastoral relations as they exist ordinarily among us, it was his wish, as it would have been his aim, to avoid confining his sympathies, efforts, and affections to the limited circle of a parish or a sect. Himself an inquirer and earnest seeker after spiritual truth, he was liberal in his toleration, and eclectic in his philosophy. Not a Swedenborgian, he found much of value and beauty in the works of Emanuel Swedenborg, and freely accepted and gratefully acknowledged all the good which was afforded at his hands. A student of philosophy, he was no man's blind disciple. A preacher of the Gospel and of Goodness, he wished to be no sectarian advocate. In sympathy and in form an Unitarian Preacher, he had a heart to love all holiness, and a mind to appreciate all worthiness and truth. Firm in his view, while it was to him vital, he deemed it no shame to change, and could look back in recollection and

forward in prospect of modification, confident in the results of honest, earnest, and prayerful seeking after truth. In a letter written at New York, whither he had gone to embark, and on the very day of his departure, he thus speaks, —

“I do not let myself realize the length of my absence from you. God bless you, and keep you. Whether we shall ever meet again on earth, he only knows; but two who are so near and dear to one another must meet again; if not here, then hereafter. I wish you to think of what I said to you when we were together in Roxbury, as I feel that I have now nothing better to say than that. Two years may make me a wiser, and a better, and a loftier man; but they will not so change me but what I shall be willing, nay glad, to tell you my best then.”

The conversation here alluded to was held but just previous to his departure, and embodied his idea of Christ, and of the Sacrament of the Communion. It was his view as then attained, warmly and heartily real to him, but held not as immutable, not necessarily permanent. That morbid feeling for consistency, which would prevent progress for fear of discordance, had no influence over him. We ask not that the tune of to-day shall resound henceforth forever in our ears, but only seek a harmony in the sounds that, occurring in close connection, go to form the tune. Though to-day's note be joyous, to-morrow's may be sad, and yet the instrument is still perfect, and the change is in the touch which sweeps its chords.

Intellectual improvement, professional and general, was Mr. Wheeler's object in going abroad. It had long been his cherished wish to complete in Europe a course of study preparatory to any permanent establishment in life, and though circumstances of a domestic nature seemed for a time to rise up in opposition to the accomplishment of his plan, it was carried into execution, and in August, 1842, he took leave of his numerous friends, and sailed for Havre, in view of two years' residence abroad. In conformity with his original plan, he proceeded to Heidelberg, and in this ancient University City passed the winter of 1842-3, engaged in the acquisition of the German language, attendance on certain lectures, and study of philosophic and classic literature. The purposes in furtherance of which this tour was undertaken are succinctly declared in a letter written to the present writer, soon after the death of a brother. He has spoken of the affliction which has befallen

him, and of its possible influence upon his plans. As to his visit abroad, he says, —

“All will depend upon a conscientious view to be taken some eight months hence, of the advantages of going to Germany compared with those of staying at home. I shall not go to gratify any whim, curiosity, or love of distinction. But if I feel that I can probably become a wiser and better man, nobody will blame me for following my early passion.”

The visit thus conscientiously undertaken was carefully improved, and the history of the winter spent at Heidelberg is one of industry and progress. The first months were of necessity mainly devoted to the acquisition of the language, and to this end an attendance on certain lectures was made subservient. Study, social intercourse, and the enjoyment of the scenery and the works of art of Heidelberg and its neighboring Mannheim had served to pass the time quickly and pleasantly away, till in March last a change of residence promised increased advantages. In early March Mr. Wheeler reached Göttingen, and joined there a friend with whom the summer was to be passed in travel and in study. The last letter which the present writer received from him bore date at this city, and is in part as follows, —

“We think to leave Göttingen on 3d April for Weimer and Jena, and shall divide that month between those cities, Leipzig, Dresden, and Halle. The operations for the succeeding months are yet undetermined.”

The next succeeding month was passed upon a bed of illness, and on the 13th day of June, death, with gentle hand, put a period to his earthly pilgrimage, and freed his pure and lovely spirit for a wider range and loftier teachings than this world in all its riches can bestow. A foreign land has received the remains of one who was so dear, and strangers' hands have hollowed out his grave. No mother's form was bending over his death-pillow, no father's broken voice breathed over him a prayer. The eyes, which have been brightened by his smile, had not the melancholy privilege of pouring their tears above his marble brow. The hands, that had but lately grasped his own in a hopeful and trustful farewell, can never again renew their affectionate pressure. The word of love, which bade him God-speed as he left us, can never again reach him who slumbers in his distant grave. Sad, sad indeed, the thought that he

is gone. Gone in his beauty, his manliness, his purity, and his love. Gone in the fullness of promise, in the gladness of his realized hopes. A whole-souled man is always but ill spared; how doubly sad the loss when youth and holiness have combined to make him dear. He has gone from us who loved him, and has left in many hearts a void which cannot be filled. He was firm in his integrity, warm in his affections, white and spotless in his purity. Unwearied in industry, he was blessed with powers of intellect which enabled him to attain abundant fruits of his labors. Joyous and serene in temperament, he was fitted to experience the world's best pleasures, and was armed to contend with its sorrows. An unruffled amiability of temper was eminently characteristic of Mr. Wheeler, and did much to endear him to his many friends. No recollection of past ill-nature can arise to shade our remembrance of him, no thought of past unkindness to chill our warm love for his memory. Life wore ever to him a smiling aspect, and its highest developments and its most homely experiences were alike the sources of gratitude and love.

"Do what I will," he says in a letter, "all things *will* wear a shining and a smiling front, and so I cannot help smiles and laughter. Let me laugh then, 'for he who laughs much commits no deadly sin.'"

The letter, which next succeeded that from which we have just quoted, contained intelligence of the death of a dear and affectionate brother, and it breathed a tone of confidence and love, which comes home to the hearts of those who now mourn for him who wrote it.

"You remember that in my last letter, I said that life would wear a cheerful look to me, do what I would. I feel bound to say that my state of mind is as cheerful now as at the time of writing that letter. I am not, nor do I care to be, in so *riant* a mood as then. But I now believe as a thing of faith, what I have long held as a theory, the perfect manifestations of the Divine Love in the life of each one of us. So far as concerns the living, the saddest experiences are but the shadings in the picture which Providence is ever painting. Sorrow that those we love are taken away is not wrong; but faith that God holds the issues of life and death in his hands, and that nothing can take place without his will, will rob that sorrow of its sting. I have been called upon to taste a new cup of sorrow, and found that the pang of separation was sharper in this case than ever be-

fore ; but found also that I had not lived two years and three quarters since Hildreth's death for nothing. That event found me a boy ; this finds me a man ; that came upon me a dreamer of theories ; this finds me a believer. That event saddened my feelings for a time ; this, as I verily believe, has deepened my whole nature for eternity. I said then I will resist evil ; now sin seems to me well nigh impossible. My views of life are as cheerful as ever ; my thoughts of death far less unpleasant."

Let us take example from him who has gone before ; in his own words we may read our consolation ; in the purity of his life we may realize how sin was to him well nigh impossible, how holiness is attainable through sorrow and bitter tears. He was lovely and beloved, for he was earnest, pure, and true. Away from his home and his kindred, he met his Father's call. Absent, but thank God, not alone, he laid him down to die, and in calmness and serenity breathed forth his latest breath. By friendly hands were his falling eyelids pressed, and a voice of his native tongue was speaking his last farewell.

THE MINISTRY AT LARGE IN BOSTON.

IN the last number of the Examiner some remarks were made, in relation to the present form of the ministry at large, in Boston, which have called forth the communication which follows, and to which we very willingly give a place in our journal. The opinions we then expressed were expressed with deliberation, and with no more strength of phrase than we then thought, and now think, the case requires. If this were not a subject of great practical importance, we should not have offered our pages for the present communication to our correspondent, nor occupied them with any further words of our own. But its real importance must be our justification with our readers. Still, if more is to be said on one side and the other, we think a paper of more frequent appearance will prove a more convenient medium of communication.

We now ask the attention of our readers to the communication of "One of our Ministers at Large," and then to the observations subjoined.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER:

In the September number of the Examiner is a notice of the Eighth Report of the London Domestic Missionary Society. In this notice but little is said respecting the London Mission, while several reflections are offered respecting the Ministry at Large among ourselves. Some important and just views are presented respecting the poor, and the duty of the more prosperous classes towards them; while several statements are made upon the ministry at large, which might lead many readers to very erroneous conclusions.

In alluding to Dr. Tuckerman, the writer says, "We still think the device of Dr. Tuckerman the most perfect, and practicable as perfect, ever conceived for the moral redemption, as well as the present immediate relief of the poor in cities." The writer then goes on to say, that "the ministry at large, according to Dr. Tuckerman's idea, has declined or perished of late years. In Providence, we believe, there is a single minister. In Boston, we suppose we are correct in saying, there is now not one."

It seems to be an imperative duty that this statement should be corrected. There are individuals connected with the fraternity of churches, who are employed as ministers at large. And unless these men are false to their trust, they are what they profess to be. They visit daily among the poor; they devote time and strength to this work; they search into the waste places; they penetrate into the darkest regions of vice and poverty; they cultivate a personal acquaintance with the wretched — administer, as far as they can judiciously, to their temporal wants; but especially do they strive to reclaim them from error, and to elevate them from their degraded state.

The ministers under the direction of the fraternity of churches, are not only understood to be ministers to the poor by the fraternity, but by the community at large; and hence the poor and the vicious are constantly sent to them from various sections of the city. The same idea is prevalent among the poor, who in their hours of trial, seek the ministers for aid and counsel.

It may matter but little, perhaps, by what name these laborers are known, yet while they are universally called ministers at large, it might convey a false impression to say that there is not one at present in the labor, and that the mission itself had perished.

The Examiner speaks as if, since Dr. Tuckerman's death, the ministry in which he was engaged had taken a different turn; whereas, during Dr. Tuckerman's life, (and under his superintending care,) this ministry was carried on precisely as it is at the present day.

When Dr. Tuckerman first entered upon his labors, he probably had no very definite purpose, except to do good in the way which should seem to him best — waiting until continued labors among the poor should enable him to devise wise methods for their improvement. He very soon found it important to obtain a lecture room, where many gladly gathered around him; so fully was he satisfied of the advantage of publicly addressing those who would come to hear, that in his second report, he asks if no one is willing to build a "*Synagogue*." Not long after this, a "Free Chapel" was erected, in which for some years Dr. Tuckerman preached. As he extended his visits and labors among the poor, he became more generally known, and larger numbers flocked around him that they might listen to his counsels. If what he said was worth saying to fifty, he felt that it was worth saying to many more. The first Free Chapel accommodated about three hundred persons. It was felt by the friends of the mission that yet more good could be accomplished by a more permanent building, and one which would accommodate a somewhat larger number. The first meeting, which was called to take the subject into consideration, was held at the house of Dr. Tuckerman, he being most deeply interested in it. His views, at this time, were strictly adhered to, as they have been throughout. He looked upon the whole plan as being in harmony with his fondest desires, and as the happy result of his arduous labors. When the building was completed, he said, "My hopes are now realized; this puts the ministry at large on a permanent foundation, and is as a guarantee of its success." After this chapel was opened, Dr. Tuckerman, though in feeble health, preached in it several times, and those who heard him remember the fervor with which he looked around and expressed his gratitude to God for such a fulfilment of his prayers. He lived

several years after this, and watched the operations of the chapel, and the general labors of the ministry, with affectionate interest. Never did he express the thought, that the chapels were a departure from his idea; but, on the contrary, to the day of his death, he expressed strongly his entire sympathy, and considered them as a most important auxiliary in the great work.

The poor constantly attend these chapels. The vicious and the wretched attend them. Persons who come from "garret and cellar, and alley and lane;" and persons too, who come with bitter griefs in their hearts, and who feel the woes of a crushing poverty. It is true that some attend the chapels, who are not absolutely poor, and this is considered by many as one of their most beautiful features. They are so conducted as not to cut off the poor as a cast. Those who are not absolutely poor are willing to mingle with those who are less fortunate, and labor for their good. They are generally elevated but a little above poverty themselves, and to the very utmost of their ability these individuals contribute to the support of the chapels and the institutions of religion. To cut off such persons from attending the chapels, would be like cutting off the right hand of the ministry. These are the connecting links which run up from the lowest towards the higher. They give all they are able to give, to defray the chapel expenses; and in addition to this, they aid by their visits among the poorer, and by coöperations with the ministers at large, in their general plans. It is no departure from the Christian labor in which we are engaged, that some such worship with us. It is probably not saying too much when it is said, that never has a poor person been crowded out of these chapels since the day they were opened, while many poor persons have been led to enter them from the general appearance of comfort, and the harmony and love that reigned within.

In regard to preparation for the Sabbath labors, if a minister to the poor is to preach, he ought to prepare as faithfully to meet one hundred as five hundred. If he were to meet one hundred in a small hall, and the one hundred were edified, if the address had been in a chapel, and a larger number had heard it, probably more good here might have been accomplished. If a minister visits among the poor, and never meets them collectively—he has a congregation, but they are scattered so that he must go and say to each one, what, if they were together, might

be said to all at once. The idea of the chapel then is that the minister, in addition to his visits, may see the scattered congregation at times brought together for social worship, and where, with good air and better accommodations, they may listen to the preacher's instruction. If a small hall would be an advantage, a more commodious and better ventilated chapel would enable the preacher to accomplish yet greater good. And with this view the simple chapels, connected with this ministry, were erected. The preacher does not necessarily become a sermon writer; for he may follow the model given him by Jesus and the apostles. It was certainly not Dr. Tuckerman's idea, that a man should neglect his own mind. Careful study is for all, and particularly for one who is to advise others. But a minister may tax his powers, and gather information from books, and yet do much to aid his fellow creatures in intercourse with them at their homes. Perhaps the minister, who prepares to meet his people with a regular sermon or discourse, does no more than it would be well for him to do, even if he had no chapel. In visiting from house to house, he gains experience, which enables him to preach, and in preaching he gains a power which enables him the better to converse, and aids him greatly in his daily walks.

But whatever views may be entertained in regard to the chapels, they are certainly not a departure from Dr. Tuckerman's idea. He lived to see their success, and rejoiced in their prosperity.

It is but just to add that there are others, besides those of our denomination, who labor among the poor. "The Boston City Missionary Society" is in successful operation, and has been in existence for more than twenty years. There are Baptist and Orthodox ministers, who visit from house to house, and are indefatigable in their pursuit of vice. Such men were in the work before Dr. Tuckerman came to the city. It was not until the 5th of November, 1826, that Dr. Tuckerman commenced visiting the poor in Boston; while there were not only, long before this, Christians of other denominations laboring as visitors among the poor, but a regular society was formed among the Orthodox churches for its systematic support. The Society for the Moral and Religious Instruction of the Poor, was organized by the Orthodox churches, October 9th, 1816, and incorporated in the year 1820. When Dr. Tuckerman entered this work, then, he did not originate the plan of visiting

the poor, even in the city, of his labors. But as he continued his labors, he constantly felt the need of a more permanent ministry, one improvement after another suggested itself, until he had the satisfaction of seeing his views more truly realized in the fraternity of churches and the free chapels. If Dr. Tuckerman did not originate this, he originated nothing. And those, who would strip the ministry at large of the chapels, would throw the ministry back to where it was before Dr. Tuckerman's day. They would undo what he has done, and rob this ministry of all that peculiarly marks it as connected with him.

If, therefore, it is true, as the Examiner says, that "the device of Dr. Tuckerman is the most perfect, and practicable as perfect, ever conceived for the moral redemption as well as the present immediate relief of the poor in cities," is it not well to understand what that device was; and to allow that these chapels are the most striking feature in this ministry, which can be traced to him? The visiting from house to house was practised long before, and is practised now. It was considered important and essential from the first, and it is considered important and essential still. The two now are united, and made powerfully to aid each other.

It is pleasant to feel that the ministry at large, as it is at present conducted, is in exact accordance with the idea of Dr. Tuckerman. The clergymen, connected with the labor at this time, claim to have originated nothing, and they protest against the statement of having departed from the original idea of this ministry. They deny that they have departed from the work which was given them to do. Such a statement is untrue in itself, and unjust to the individuals concerned in the labor. It is a reflection upon the churches—upon the executive committee, and upon the ministers at large themselves.

That there is yet more to be done, no one can doubt. •The city is large; it has greatly increased in population, and there are a vast multitude, who should be won from vice to virtue. In addition to the ministers who are now employed, there is ample room for two or three others, whose sole duty it might be, to visit—or, if they preached, do so in the chapels already erected. The chapels might be considered as central points, from which the laborers should verge in every direction, until not one hovel should be left unvisited, and every abode of loneliness and want, throughout the circumference of the city,

should be made to feel the influence of Christian Love and Truth.

The work is not yet done — or the whole field occupied. Much has been accomplished, and we believe in the right way ; what we have now to do is to go forward and not backward. The ministers at large have felt a sacred joy in their efforts to carry out the great principles of their venerated father and friend ; and have sought, and will yet seek, with earnest labor, to do what they can, to extend and establish the religion of that blessed Saviour, who was anointed to preach the Gospel to the Poor.

ONE OF THE MINISTERS AT LARGE.

Boston, October, 1843.

Very much such an account is here given by our correspondent of the societies, in connexion with the Fraternity of Churches, as we should have expected. It agrees with all we have known and heard of them. It is an account of an institution with which, except for its name, we have found no fault, and have none to find, in whose prosperity we rejoice most heartily, whose decline we should deplore as a great evil, whose ministers we truly honor. Our ground of difference is not whether it is an excellent institution, and answering a purpose which no other in the city now does, but simply whether it fulfils the proper idea, and the prevailing one, of the Ministry at Large, as it was when it first went into operation, and as it is described in the writings of its founder. In our judgment it is not such an institution. It has, in the progress of years, so changed its character, that the truth only is spoken, when it is asserted that the proper Ministry at Large no longer exists in our city: "One of the Ministers," in what he has said above, has described the condition and action of what is well known in all our cities as a "free church" — a church formed out of the poorer classes — save that when the preacher is eminent all sorts of people crowd in — whose worshippers come and go as they please, sit where they please, and pay what they please, in the form either of a Sunday collection, or of an annual or monthly subscription, a part of the expense being borne perhaps by rich individuals interested in its prosperity. A minister presides over the congregation, and preaches ; visiting also, as a pastor, the families which constitute his hearers. So far as he visits more or less, it is among the poorer classes, for no

others are numbered among the permanent [members of his flock. And doubtless circumstances, and his own deep interest in the duty, often carry him beyond the limits of his own society. This is, perhaps, a correct definition of what is understood by a free church, and which is to be found in all our larger towns in connexion with various denominations. It is this which our correspondent has described. But this is not what we understand by the ministry at large. It does not satisfy our conception of what Dr. Tuckerman instituted and advocated with so much power and zeal. Admitting even in the case of the Boston ministers, that visiting bears a larger proportion to their other labors than in similar churches elsewhere, still our idea of the ministry for the poor is not met.

The central idea of Dr. Tuckerman's ministry is the frequent visiting of the poor in their places of habitation, so as to form and maintain the most intimate relations of Christian friendship, — a visiting from house to house, "day by day, from morning until night," — a visiting so constant and unintermitting as, in comparison with any other duty or employment, to constitute the sole business of the minister. No one can peruse the printed reports of this eminent man, and not be struck with the very different manner in which he speaks of preaching and visiting. The last constitutes the burden of his eloquent pages, preaching, the chapel and its services, come in incidentally in a few words at the close of his reports. In the first report of the second year of his labors, in which he unfolds at length his idea of this ministry, and what it should aim to accomplish, is it, or is it not, the chapel and its audiences that occupy his thoughts, and engage his sympathies? Nothing has surprised us so much in the communication of our correspondent, as his labored argument to show that the Free Chapel constitutes the distinctive peculiarity of Dr. Tuckerman's plan for the relief of the poor of our cities. So total a misconception of that plan, as we hold it to be, on the part of one of the principal ministers, makes it no longer wonderful that the change should have taken place in the form and condition of the institution, which we have affirmed — that preaching should have come to predominate over visiting. But is this a misconception? We cannot afford time and room to argue out so plain a question. We can only refer the reader for our justification to Dr. Tuckerman's reports. If he is interested in the

subject, and has already read, and remembers those reports, there can have been but one impression made and left upon his mind. What different language Dr. Tuckerman may have used in conversation we do not know. But when engaged in establishing this ministry in New York a few years since, we well remember how subordinate a feature in its organization was a chapel. One was to be procured and opened for Sunday worship, if convenient to do so, if a good room could be obtained, if funds for its support could be collected. In regard to the visiting there were no ifs; this was the prime essential, the one thing needful.

By way of showing that visiting does not constitute the characteristic peculiarity of this ministry we are told, that the Baptists, and the Orthodox, together with certain missionaries, were engaged in visiting the poor before Dr. Tuckerman came to Boston. But surely the only question here is, in what proportion and in what manner, with what method and with what extensive views did they visit the poor. There have always been visitors of the poor in all places and times. Bishop Cheverus was a constant friend and visitor among them. But nevertheless neither he nor others, who visited in the same manner, were ministers at large in the sense of Dr. Tuckerman. It is not visiting only that defines this ministry, but the manner and degree of it. Neither is it, on the other hand, as our correspondent contends, "Free Chapels," that make its peculiarity. When and where has there ever been any form of the Christian Ministry without its chapels? Surely there was nothing *original* in the opening either of chapels, or of free chapels for Sunday preaching. This was not the peculiarity for which we hold in so much honor the memory of Tuckerman. What was original, if there was anything original and peculiar, was certainly this, the institution of a permanent order of men, well qualified for their office, supported by permanent salaries like the regular ministry, whose daily and hourly duty it should be to visit at their homes, for purposes of moral and religious influence and the relief of their temporal wants, the poor of cities. In our judgment this was, and this only was, original and peculiar. In specifying the particular offices this ministry was to perform in its intercourse with the subjects of it, it will be observed in Dr. Tuckerman's reports, that they are such as can be performed only by seeing the poor in their dwellings. It contemplates such frequency of personal intercourse, that the minister shall in truth become the familiar

friend of those he visits, intimately acquainted with their whole condition and wants, ready, and competent, through knowledge of their character and their affairs, to be their adviser and helper in all their straits, and thus to obtain over them a religious and moral influence to be obtained in no other way. Occasional and interrupted intercourse between the rich and the poor, between ministers or missionaries and the poor, has always existed ; but who before Dr. Tuckerman showed the practicableness and urged the duty of forming a class of visitors, whose life-long employment, whose sole employment it should be to minister to their wants, and whose number should be such as to comprise within their several cures *all* the poor of a city, not an individual soul escaping their vigilant search, or losing the advantage of their ministrations, except through their own determination not to be found of them or helped. Whether original or not, this is the idea of Dr. Tuckerman's ministry, this is the theory of the institution he has described in his writings, which he labored to establish on a permanent foundation, and which he confidently prophesied would one day be found in every city in Christendom. If, rather than this, preaching in Free Chapels to large congregations constitutes the essential element of his plan, it is singular, at least, that he dwelt upon it so little ; especially singular that his practice seemed to oppose any such construction of his purpose. He preached himself, a part of the time, but once on the Sunday. But if he had thought this the chief thing, he would have husbanded his little strength for what was to be the great effort. The last days of the week, at least, would have been given to the repose necessary to recruit him for the Sabbath. His practice was quite otherwise ; he devoted himself to visiting during the week, to the various forms of practical preaching, and then with what strength was left spake to his people on Sunday, often delegating that service to others.

The question, accordingly, as to what constitutes the ministry is purely a question of proportion, of relation ; it is not visiting alone, nor preaching alone, nor both together, in the way in which they are commonly united. But it is distinctly a ministry in which domiciliary visitation "from day to day, and from morning till night," shall abound in an immense proportion over all other duties and cares, there being so much preaching only on the Sunday, as the toil and labor of the week shall have left strength and time for. Visiting is the first, second, and third

thing, the beginning and the ending ; preaching, in the technical sense, wholly secondary and subordinate. This, we are confident, both from the spirit and the letter of Dr. Tuckerman's reports, was his idea of his ministry ; this, we believe, would be the idea which any unprejudiced mind would receive from reading his works. Had he lived to see the chapel in the least degree taking precedence of the daily visits, interfering with, and absorbing to itself the time that should be devoted to them, we believe he would have deplored it as an injurious deviation from his plan. It had been long known what preaching could do for the very poor ; the aim of Dr. Tuckerman was to learn, by an effectual experiment, what a thorough system of personal visitation and oversight would effect. For our own part we cannot doubt, that large chapels in connexion with this ministry are an injury, and will end in the destruction of the institution, or in other words, will deprive it of its original and proper character.

The reasoning of our correspondent is, it seems to us, hardly sound when he says, that what is good for, and may be spoken to a few, is equally good for, and may be spoken to many, to a multitude. Truths, that are good for a few, are equally good for many, and for all, doubtless ; but uttering them to a crowd, in a large building, in all the formality of a public service, is by no means the same thing with saying them to a few, in a small upper room, or in the sick chamber, or at the funeral of some poor person, in narrow and humble quarters. Is it possible, that preaching should be the same easy, familiar, unexhausting process in the one case as in the other ? We fearlessly affirm, that in any case a large chapel, for six or three hundred hearers, will occasion such an absorption of the mind of a minister in the duties and preparations of the pulpit, especially if he obtain a general popularity and draw together a promiscuous audience, as to leave him only half a minister, and half a man, for the poor at their homes. Such preaching and such visiting cannot go along together. *Ceci tuera cela.* The preaching will kill the visiting. We think this only the natural, almost necessary, consequence. And we accordingly judge the building of chapels a mistake — small hired rooms in the very quarters of the poor serving a better purpose — the building of *large chapels* a fatal mistake. In the present instance, the erection of such chapels has been attended accidentally by very important and valuable results — large, and what seem to be permanent, congregations having

been gathered — and, we repeat, we would have them maintained as they are, partly by contributions on the part of those who attend, — the farther this principle of support is carried the better, — and partly by contributions from independent sources. But that they have had the effect to cause such a deviation from the original idea of the ministry to the poor, as to constitute a new and different institution, we should think the blindest must acknowledge.

That the public think very much as we do, we hope we may infer from no defence having been set up against our remarks published two months since. The *Miscellany* maintains, in effect, the same ground as ourselves. It complains that our language was too strong, but admits the deviation of which we speak ; and this deviation is just the change which deprives this ministry of its peculiar character, and confounds it with other institutions similar, but not the same, and announces its virtual extinction. An admirable organization remains; but the peculiarity that made it a ministry at large has disappeared. The executive committee of the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches, in language employed at the close of their last report, appear to feel that the ministry in its present form is not answering its proper ends. They say ; —

“ We have but two missionaries in this field, — we need to have three or four or five. We do not need, it is not necessary, nor would it be expedient, to have more *Chapels* ; but we do need more missionaries; we want more ministers to aid and co-operate with those already employed, — that there may be more visiting and preaching from house to house, that they may go about continually among the poor in their dwellings, be with them daily in their temptations, search out the solitary, the out-cast, the forsaken, the degraded, and bring the power of divine and regenerating truth to bear upon their hearts and consciences, and lift them out of the abyss of sin and suffering, and place them erect upon the rock of truth, and inspire them with a living faith. Your Committee have long felt the need of this. The ministers at large themselves have felt it. The growth of our city, now numbering over thirty thousand more than when this ministry was started, and its increasing growth, show it to be reasonable.” — pp. 22, 23.

We do not doubt that, as our correspondent states, visiting the poor makes a part of his labors. But the question is, and the only question, in what proportion ? We are struck with

the few words devoted to the subject in the above communication, and with its vague statements. In the ninth Report, also, there is no particularity and specification in regard to the performance of this duty, such as we could wish to see. In the Reports of Dr. Tuckerman, he was careful to give the exact number of his visits — in so many months he had made twelve, thirteen, or nineteen hundred visits — intimating very clearly in this minute enumeration, what he conceived the chief duty of the office to be. If we are wrong in our belief that at present preaching, in this ministry, abounds over visiting, we have then committed a wrong. If it is the daily practice of the present ministers to spend the working hours of every day of the week, from morning till night, six, or eight hours, in the kind of visiting this office contemplates, then they are genuine Ministers at Large. If the work of visiting does not in this manner absolutely constitute the business of every day, and the whole day, we cannot think that the institution is carried out in the spirit of its true intent. In nothing that we have said do we imply that preaching is a *departure* from the idea of Dr. Tuckerman — but only that *too much* preaching is — that *too little* visiting is. It is all, as we have said, a question of proportion and relation. The ministry — in its peculiarity and special value — has perished, when visiting has become a secondary and subordinate office.

We cannot see why the free chapels and the ministry at large should not exist, and do their work in harmonious action. We would not say one word to touch the prosperity of these Free Churches. Let them go on prospering and multiplying to the greatest extent possible; only let them not be confounded with a Ministry at Large. Perhaps by the addition of other ministers to the present churches, whose whole duty should be visiting, all would be accomplished. We are only anxious to disabuse the public mind of an error, if it is in the habit of thinking or boasting that a ministry at large in the true sense at present exists. So far as such error prevails, it is injurious, as the city is thereby deprived of an institution that might otherwise be revived. No duty is more imperative on those who have the highest welfare of the city at heart — its wealthy citizens and its government — than the reinstitution in vigorous and healthy action, in every quarter of the town, of a proper ministry at large. Such a ministry constitutes a true Christian police, that in the process of time would take the place of every other.

Policy, Humanity, Religion, alike call for its establishment on a permanent foundation.

We observe some reiteration in what we have hastily prepared, while the last sheets of our number are passing through the press. But we are willing it should all be reiteration, if we could thereby give any additional force to the expression of our conviction, that *visiting* constitutes the Ministry at Large; and that it is impossible, as it is a thing unreasonable to require or expect, for the same persons to be preachers and pastors of large, and in great part, fixed congregations, and at the same time Ministers at Large, so bearing a double burden and performing the functions of two distinct offices. Either the present churches should take the name which alone properly describes them, and a new ministry be set on foot, or a second minister should be added, as soon as funds can be procured, to each of the existing congregations. We cannot see that any wrong is done by expressing this opinion; at least, if we err, or offend, it is not through wantonness, but through a deep interest in an important subject.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

1. *Presbytery and not Prelacy the Scriptural and Primitive Polity, Proved from the Testimonies of Scripture; the Fathers; the Schoolmen; Reformers; and the English and Oriental Churches. Also, the Antiquity of Presbytery; including an Account of the Ancient Culdees, and of St. Patrick.* By THOMAS SMYTH, Author of Lectures on the Apostolical Succession, Ecclesiastical Republicanism, Ecclesiastical Catechism, etc. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1843. 8vo. pp. 568.
2. *Ecclesiastical Republicanism; or the Republicanism, Liberty, and Catholicity of Presbytery, in Contrast with Prelacy and Popery.* By THOMAS SMYTH, Author of Lectures on the Apostolical Succession, &c. &c. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1843. 12mo. pp. 323.

HERE are two more volumes by the indefatigable Author of the Lectures on the "Prelatical Doctrine of Apostolical Succession Examined," noticed in our November Number for 1841. In regard to the first,—"Presbytery and not Prelacy the Scrip-

tural and Primitive Doctrine," — the Author observes, in his Preface, —

"As to the necessity of the work, nothing need be said. This is now universally admitted. A renewed and thorough discussion of the great principles, involved in the exclusive assumptions of prelacy, is forced upon us by the open and repeated assaults made by this bold enemy, upon the rights and privileges of all other Christian denominations. The conviction is therefore general, that this controversy must become the leading topic of the age."

Again,

"The aim of this work is catholic, and not sectarian. The Author appears as the advocate, not of a party, but of all non-episcopal denominations. He includes under the term presbytery, those generic principles which are common to Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Reformed Dutch, Lutherans, Baptists, and Methodists. In some points he will be found differing from members of each of these bodies, but most generally he hopes to be found agreeing with the liberal-minded of them all."

As Congregationalists, certainly, we cannot go along with the author in all his views. Yet so far as regards his great leading principle, or position, that the only bishops recognised in Scripture, or known to Christian antiquity, are presbyter bishops, who were, in truth, parochial bishops, (we call them Congregational bishops,) we entirely agree with him. Such bishops were the only bishops known in the primitive churches, and are the only bishops, who can be properly called Apostolical. And they still exist in all our churches. Congregational ministers are bishops in the scriptural sense of the term, and according to primitive usage.

The only apostolical, or scriptural bishops, then, are presbyter bishops. This the author attempts to establish in opposition to modern and high-church episcopacy, which maintains that bishops and priests (or presbyters) constitute two distinct orders, and which asserts the "divine right" of Prelacy. To primitive episcopacy he has no objection; nor have we. We claim it for ourselves, for our congregational churches. We say that there was originally no other episcopacy than now exists in our Congregational churches, the minister being bishop, or overseer, of the flock, for that is the primitive meaning of the term.

"Apostolicity," says Mr. Smyth, "has been claimed by Presbyterians in all ages." Certainly, we repeat, our Congregational churches claim it. Every minister, having the oversight of a parish, is a bishop.

The author takes a wide range; he goes back to the ministry of the Saviour; he examines the Apostolic age, in which the

terms bishop and presbyter were used as perfectly synonymous; he shows that presbyters were originally, and are still, by right "clothed with all the powers of the ministry," ordination included. For proofs of this he appeals to the Scriptures, to the Fathers, to the Schoolmen, to Prelatists themselves, and especially to the voice of the early Anglican Church. The conclusion is, that "presbyterian ordination is more valid, certain, and regular than prelatical ordination," that this claim of prelacy, or the peculiar power and prerogatives of the bishops, of which we now hear so much, are, as they have been demonstrated to be over and over again, wholly unfounded.

These and several other topics, more or less intimately connected with the main subject, are discussed in the volume with great thoroughness. The author does not lay claim to any novelty of facts, or argument, his design being rather to rearrange old materials, and as he expresses it, to "condense the substance of innumerable treatises which have been written on the subject."

We proceed now to the second work named at the head of this notice, "*Ecclesiastical Republicanism*." Again, by a very liberal construction of the term Presbyterian, the author includes under it, not only Presbyterians proper, and known by name as such, but Baptists, Lutherans, the Protestant Methodist church, and "the whole body of New England Puritans, although now generally denominated Congregationalists." He denies, however, that the last named possess the "true character" of Congregationalists. "They are," he says, "essentially Presbyterian." We like, however, the old name of Congregationalists; and the Congregational polity, certainly, differs, in some particulars, which we deem important, from the Presbyterian strictly so called. Mr. Smyth speaks of Congregationalists as having "associations or consociations, which meet at regular periodical times, and exercise all the powers of our (Presbyterian) Synods." Such associations, or consociations, we say, are destructive of pure Congregationalism, and the attempt to introduce them in Massachusetts, some years ago, was sternly resisted, and defeated. But we will let this pass.

The object of the writer is to show, that the principle of Episcopacy is essentially monarchical, and that of Presbyterianism, republican. He speaks of the republicanism of the Jewish and Christian churches. "Each individual church," says Mosheim, in his Commentaries on the affairs of Christians before the time of Constantine, "assumed to itself the form and rights of a little distinct republican commonwealth; and with

regard to its internal concerns, was wholly regulated by a code of laws, that, if they did not originate with, had, at least, received the sanction of the people constituting such church."

The author enters into an analysis of the "doctrinal and ecclesiastical systems" of Prebyterianism, for the purpose of showing that they are republican throughout. He then proceeds to the historical argument. He finds the republican tendencies of Presbyterianism, and the monarchical tendencies of Episcopacy, strikingly developed in the annals of the past. He examines the history of the Waldenses, and of the Reformation. "Those states," he says, "which possessed a republican form of government, were the first to raise the standard of revolt," and he goes on to illustrate this at some length, by an appeal to historical facts. — "No small part of the enmity of many European monarchs to the Reformation originated in their fear of its republican tendencies." Again, "it cannot be doubted, that the sovereigns were made thoughtful at an early period, by the democratic tendencies of institutions, which vested the government of churches in the body of Christians."

The Scotch, Genevan, and Swiss churches, John Knox, Buchanan, and others, are made to pass in review before us. The author then turns to English history, and here his materials rapidly accumulate. Puritanism and Presbyterianism engaged in deadly conflict with Episcopacy and the throne, and overthrew them. "Protestanism," says Carlyle, "was a revolt against spiritual sovereignties, popes, and much else. Presbyterianism carried out the revolt against earthly sovereignties and despotisms."

King James says, that Presbyterianism "agrees with monarchy as well as God with the devil." Charles I. was much of the same opinion, — his maxim was, "No bishop, no king." In truth the republican tendencies of Presbyterianism were continually urged by the royalists, of which the author gives several examples. Dryden, poet laureate, sang the praises of monarchy, as Puseyite poets now sing the glories of High-churchism, and denounces the Presbyterians in good round set terms. Thus ends a passage of this sort in his *Hind and Panther*.

"So Presbytery and its pestilential zeal,
Can flourish only in a common weal."

The author next comes to the history of the United States. He quotes M. de Tocqueville, who says, that the democratic principle came in with the original settlers, — the puritan fathers, — along "with the parish system, that fruitful germ of free institutions." Puritanism was the father of the American revolution.

Dr. Chandler, discussing the question, whether or not bishops ought to be introduced into America, says, "Episcopacy and monarchy are, in their frame and constitution, best suited to each other. Episcopacy can never thrive in a republican government, nor republican principles in an Episcopal church." . . . "He, that prefers monarchy in the State, is more likely to approve of Episcopacy in the Church, than a rigid republican," and more in the same strain. — p. 153. On this ground, among others, the introduction of Episcopacy into the colonies was opposed.

The author adds, "That Episcopalians more generally espoused the British cause, in the revolutionary struggle, than Presbyterians, is candidly admitted by bishop White, who says that of those who were thus inclined, '*a great proportion were Episcopalians.*' In New England, the Episcopal clergy were royalists almost to a man." — p. 156.

The author then proceeds to consider the character of Episcopacy as now organized among us. The "anti-republicanism of High-churchism" is the title of one of his sections. But we cannot follow him through this, and several other topics of which he treats with greater or less fulness. We have said enough to show the nature and object of the work, which is all we intended.

Whatever may be thought of some of his views, and to some of them, as before said, we cannot assent, — we are compelled to say, that all his treatises give evidence of earnestness, and great patience of research and labor; they abound in historical facts and illustrations; and so far as prelacy is concerned, prove for the thousandth time, that it has no root in Scripture, or primitive antiquity.

Lays of my Home, and other Poems. By JOHN G. WHITTIER.
Boston: William D. Ticknor, 1843. 16mo. pp. 122.

WE had designed and hoped to have given this little volume a more extended and elaborate notice than our space and leisure now permit. Yet our narrow limits are to be the less regretted, as the vocabulary of praise is less ample than that of censure, and our object is, not to find fault, but to urge those, who know Mr. Whittier only by name, to cultivate his more intimate acquaintance. Jericho seemed impregnable to Joshua and his men of valor; but its walls fell at the sound of the trumpet. The host of Midian in the days of Gideon were as the stars, or the sand for multitude; but the trumpet and the torch were the

only weapons of their overthrow and utter ruin. We have not got far enough in the Arcana Celestia to know the spiritual meaning, which these events signify to our brethren of the new Jerusalem Church; but to us they typify the bloodless victories, which philanthropy in these latter days is to win over every ancient form of oppression and wrong, with no weapons but the torch and trumpet of Christian truth and principle. Put the trumpet at the poet's lips? Yes; why not? If, when he sings of love, and writes sonnets to the moon, the lute and lyre be his fit insignia, why is not, by parity of reason, the stirring trumpet his, with its all-awakening blast, when he asserts the rights of the down-trodden, pleads for bleeding, wounded humanity, and rebukes the wrong-doer, the tyrant monarch or the tyrant mob? Such is Whittier's mission. Not that his volume is consecrated solely to themes of this class; for there are several exquisite little paragraphs and ballads, in which there breathes indeed a spirit both kindly and devout, but which are in no sense *preaching poems*. But most of these poems have reference to the great reforms of the day, or are tributes to the memory of true-hearted reformers.

Whittier's rhythm is generally smooth and pure, yet not faultless; his diction chaste, nervous, elevated; his style not highly imaginative, but sufficiently removed from the pedestrian march of the rhymed prose that so often calls itself poetry. But we delight in his poetry, chiefly because it is genuine, transparent, because it reveals the author, and brings you into conscious and intimate converse with him, because not one line of it seems written for the sake of writing or merely to be read, but all is the spontaneous outflow of rich thought and fervent feeling. Mr. Whittier is evidently well versed in the history, and the traditional and legendary lore of his native State, and has used it with admirable effect in the "Lays of my Home." One of these, "The Ballad of Cassandra Southwick," is founded on the persecution of the Quakers by the Puritans, and seems to us equally true in its delineation of the parties and the times, and full of those elements of pathetic interest, which appeal to the universal heart.

Among the most striking pieces in the volume is one suggested by a portrait of Raphael. We would also name, as of surpassing beauty, a poem inscribed to "Follen, on reading his Essay on the Future State." But, after all, we are the most pleased with those pieces, in which the author expresses his full-souled sympathy with the genius of Christian reform. There is one inscribed "Democracy," but not the rampant democracy of the caucus and the mass-meeting; for the *golden rule* is its

text. Then there are several, referring more or less directly to the rights and the wrongs of the slave. With an extract from one of these we close our notice, hoping that we may have been the means of introducing our readers to a collection, which we have read with unmingled sympathy and pleasure. The piece, from which we quote is "Massachusetts to Virginia," a lyric of twenty-four stanzas, occasioned by the demand made by the authorities of Virginia, for the surrender of George Latimer. The following are the concluding stanzas.

"The voice of Massachusetts! Of her free sons and daughters —
Deep calling unto deep aloud — the sound of many waters!
Against the burden of that voice what tyrant power shall stand?
No fetters in the Bay State! No slave upon her land!

Look to it well, Virginians! In calmness we have borne,
In answer to our faith and trust, your insult and your scorn;
You've spurned our kindest counsels — you've hunted for our lives —
And shaken round our hearths and homes your manacles and gyves!

We wage no war — we lift no arm — we fling no torch within
The fire-damps of the quaking mine beneath your soil of sin;
We leave you with your bondmen — to wrestle while ye can,
With the strong upward tendencies and God-like soul of man!

But for us and for our children, the vow, which we have given
For Freedom and Humanity, is registered in Heaven:
No slave-hunt in our borders — no pirate on our strand!
No fetters in the Bay State — no slave upon our land!"

Anti-Slavery Melodies; for the friends of freedom. Prepared
for the Hingham Anti-Slavery Society, by JAIRUS LINCOLN.
Hingham: Published by Elijah B. Gill. 12mo. pp. 96.

For all those who love to sing their emotions or their principles on the subject of Slavery, here is an agreeable and useful manual. Several collections have preceded this; that a new one is demanded shows that the cause of Anti-Slavery, as well as a thousand others, is deriving strength from what at first would seem to be but a feeble ally. All history, however, and all great movements bear testimony to the power of music to rouse men's sluggish or coward spirits to action. War owes half its glory and its strength to music, and the other half, if it be not profane to say it, to its banners and tinsel trappings. It were a pity if the spirit of humanity, if Christian zeal for universal liberty, forgot to resort to an influence known to have been in all time past, and still to be, so potent an auxiliary in the armies, and on the side of the wicked. The friends

of Temperance have been wise in their generation, in making poetry and music play a conspicuous part in all their celebrations. They might do much more for their great reform by a more liberal employment of our best bands of instrumental music on their public occasions, in addition to the singing of songs and hymns. If the spirit of war can go to the expense, for its entertainment and greater efficiency, of indulgence in so true a luxury, the spirit of peace, the peaceful spirit of temperance, ought to be willing to do as much for the advancement of its higher aims. Every attraction the most tasteful, even the most costly, should be drawn around it.

The Anti-Slavery leaders are following at a quick pace the example thus set, and in the present volume are to be found fifty-seven hymns and songs, — part of both the music and the poetry being original and now first published, — consecrated to the Christian theme of Emancipation. The well known talent of the author and compiler of the volume, as a composer and performer of music, is a better recommendation of this collection than anything we could say, even though we had honestly sung it through, which we have not; and his equally well known devotion to the cause of freedom will be a sufficient warrant to its advocates far and near, that in these pages there lurk no heresies or short comings in doctrine, such as should render the work unworthy of their patronage.

Classical Studies: Essays on Ancient Literature and Art.

With the biography and correspondence of eminent philologists. By BARNARD SEARS, President of Newton Theological Institution; B. B. EDWARDS, Professor of Andover Theological Seminary; and C. C. FELTON, Professor in Harvard University. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln, 1843. 12mo. pp. 413.

A SENSIBLE and modest, as well as enthusiastic defence of the Classics. Not the dried pedant's petulant, intolerant, and feeble assertion of the dignity of himself and his particular hobby; but a book, which has no little life in it, which recognises the earnest demands, and ever novel phases of life; which understands by "classical studies" the study of facts, of man, and not mere words; and celebrates them, not with a smack of idle dilettantism, as sweet, refining pastimes, but with a deep sense of their worth, as wells of wisdom, and discipline for life. In such a busy day of the world, a word from those who know the worth of this thing cannot be superfluous. It is earnest enough to have a hearing.

The method of the book is well suited to its purpose. In the preface is discussed the importance of classical studies, by one of the editors. The contents of the book itself are of two kinds. *First*, some promiscuous essays, inaugural addresses, &c., translated from the writings of several distinguished German scholars and professors, which express their feeling of the moral and æsthetic dignity of the classical literature and art. Some of them, however, discuss points of interest to the scholar, as the use of the Greek dialects, the history of the Latin language, &c. And *secondly*, biographical notices and correspondence of these same German scholars, introducing us into the peculiar element which they breathe, exhibiting the rise, progress, and natural relations of those great constellations of learning, and showing the influence of such classic culture and devotion upon the lives of the men. Thus we have brought before us, both what these men have said, and what in their own persons, in their daily spirit and conversation, unconsciously they show, in behalf of this kind of learning. We have the argument of their words, and of their life. Certainly no one can read these biographies with indifference, or without being agreeably disappointed, if he expected to find nothing but the dry, monotonous, characterless plodding, which he may have associated with the very thought of a philologist. He could hardly be introduced into a more attractive and ideal society; a high and devoted brotherhood, well worthy to be styled a "republic of letters." They carry that religious earnestness, deep, still-working, into their pursuit, which makes the thought of them beautiful, as that of the poet and the artist. What a manly, generous tone pervades these letters; full of true self-respect and honor for one another — nay, noblest brotherly love! In the emulation of these scholars there is nothing mean; in their never ceasing, patient industry, nothing narrowing, or fatal to the free, full life of mind and heart. For, though they spend their lives apparently in making dictionaries, in settling the text and publishing correct editions of other men's writings, who wrote ages ago, yet all this is but subsidiary to a nobler end; it proves their thoroughness, their valiant strength, which can afford to regard these small details without evasion or contempt, while really they are studying a remarkable era of life in these writings, and filling themselves with the best spirit of a culture, which they deem in many respects superior to any the world has ever seen. Their respect for the Past is a respect for those manifestations of eternal wisdom and beauty which it contains. They feel themselves made new, while penetrating with a scholar's love, through all the

formidable apparatus of criticism and dry bones of words and forms in a dead language, into the very spirit and characteristic of the life which left these records of itself. They are not verbal critics only, but philosophers. No man is so universal that he does not contemplate the great ideas and principles, which are the object of mind, more through some special manifestations, to which his genius or his education turns him, than through all others. It is the same truth, which is revealed now in the landscape, now in art, now in music, now in poetry, now in philosophy, and now in the life of some person. And all our intercourse with truth and beauty is through manifestations. Now if outward nature can occupy the poet, his own consciousness the philosopher, and the realm of tones the musician, are not Homer, Æschylus, and Plato, too, a phenomenon, a wonderful manifestation of Truth and Beauty, which may well occupy the best powers of him, who is drawn to them, to appreciate and understand?

No small argument for classical studies may be drawn from the very fact, that these men did devote themselves so intensely to them. Read of the incredible perseverance and endurance of the young Heyne through all manner of obstacles, counting poverty and cold and hunger, a pleasant and a glorious road, if they but led him to some learned professor's lecture, or to some worn copy of a Greek Classic; consider the heroic patience and fertility of invention, by which Hemsterhuis and Wyttenbach, and Wolf and Ruhnken won their way to the proud citadel of their hopes; and does it not seem that there was life and reality at work in an impulse so strong and persevering unto victory? Does it not seem that the same Providence, which raised up the Greeks first, also had need of this school of interpreters of the Greeks now?

Of the essays above mentioned we cannot speak learnedly. Besides those already alluded to, there is one on the "Study of Greek Literature;" one on the "Study of Classical Antiquity;" and two by the venerable scholar, Frederic Jacobs, on "the wealth of the Greeks in works of Plastic Art," and one on the "Education of the Moral Sentiment among the Ancient Greeks." This last is perhaps the most important paper in the selection. It defends the moral influence of the Grecian culture, literature, and art, without any qualification; and is written with all the glowing enthusiasm of one who has become himself a Greek, by love and study of their institutions through the idealizing vista of antiquity. This over-fondness is to be pardoned, and ever respected. The translator has warned the reader in his note, what statements may be made upon the other side, and let

the German speak for himself. It certainly is the best way to get at the truth. It stands confirmed by all experience, that only love can appreciate the real worth of anything. It may be blind to all but its one peculiar theme; but it represents it, from its own proper point of view, identifies itself with it, and speaks from the inside of the fact, instead of seeing it only from without, as others must. Let every State have its own representative in a Congress which would do it justice. In this, the plan of this book is excellent. What the genuine classic scholar says, though tinged with enthusiasm, must always be the most valuable testimony on the question of classical studies. In him, and him alone, you see just what these studies are. All others misrepresent, whether they undertake to advocate or condemn. If it is the question, whether we shall teach our children music, do not go for arguments to those ignorant utilitarians, who talk about its little incidental effects upon the habits of the scholar, or the order of a school; but go to the fountain-heads of musical life and genius; go to the works of the great composers, to the men who feel and know the best, who know and show in their whole life what music is. Take their word, and take the word of others, also, who have equal right to advocate something else, about which they may chance to be enthusiastic. Always it is positive, and not negative representations, which help us to the truth.

-
1. *A Discourse preached before the Second Church in Boston, in commemoration of the life and character of their former pastor, Rev. Henry Ware Jr., D. D.; on Sunday, Oct. 1, 1843.* By their Minister, CHANDLER ROBBINS. With an Appendix. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1843. 8vo. pp. 71.
 2. *A Sermon occasioned by the death of the Rev. Henry Ware Jr., D. D.; preached in Bulfinch Street Church, Oct. 1, 1843.* By FREDERICK T. GRAY, Minister of that Church. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1843. 8vo. pp. 16.
 3. *Communion with the unseen. A Discourse delivered in the First Congregational Unitarian Church, Oct. 1, 1843.* By WILLIAM H. FURNESS, Pastor. Printed by request. Philadelphia: J. Crissy. 1843. 8vo. pp. 16.

Of the two first of these discourses we can hardly do more than record the titles; and this is of the less consequence as they

are well known and widely circulated in the neighborhood. The discourse of Mr. Robbins, from Rev. xiv. 13, contains a very full account of all the principal incidents in the life of Mr. Ware, together with a sketch of his character, all true and glowing with the warmth of personal attachment and a deep interest in the subject. A large appendix preserves the papers that passed between Mr. Ware and the Committee of the Second Church at the period of the dissolution of his connexion with it, an account of his last sickness, a list of his writings, &c.

Mr. Gray's Sermon, founded on the words, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his," commemorates the character and services of the deceased in a style of seriousness and attractive simplicity.

From the discourse of Mr. Furness, (Heb. xii. 1, 2,) known to but few in this part of the country, strongly marked by the best peculiarities of the author, we take a few of the closing paragraphs.

"We have need, my friends, as a religious denomination, as a certain portion of the household of faith, to cherish this mode of thinking [viz. considering the dead as 'present witnesses,' though unseen]. Many of our brightest lights have just gone out, and our most eloquent voices have been hushed. It is a year, to-day, since the saintly Channing ceased from among us. While living, his bodily frame was so delicate and frail, it seemed so for years to be hovering upon the borders of the grave, that his voice sounded, even then, like a voice from another world. And it was a voice from the other world, even then. For every one, who knew him, felt deeply that he dwelt in constant communion with the invisible, in intimate fellowship with eternal principles, and that he lived chiefly to make the invisible felt, to bring the great truths of Christian Right and Christian Love, down into the actual world, into the hearts, and homes, and business of men. This was the object to which his life was sacred. He spoke out of a high spiritual state, and sought with that rare eloquence of his, to win men to the high principles which alone made life dear to him. If his influence ceased with his mortal breath, our loss was indeed very great. But no, though he departed in the full maturity of his powers, though these showed no symptom of infirmity, though his voice was growing more and more earnest as he pleaded with man for man, yet we may not call his death a loss. He has vanished from our sight, but a double sanctity invests his memory. The venerated idea of him is rendered thrice venerable. He has joined the great cloud of witnesses, and as we remember him with love and reverence, it is as if he were looking down, cheering us onward, and bidding us run the race that is set before us, with new animation.

"And now after a brief interval, Channing has been followed by Greenwood and Henry Ware. Separated as we are by our position from the great body of those with whom we most nearly sympathize in our religious views, you probably have little idea, my brethren, of

the estimation in which these two men were held in our churches, of the deep and devoted affection which they inspired. How well do I remember how Mr. Greenwood was wont to fascinate and chain his hearers by the simplicity of his manner, by the tone of his voice, so musical, so deep, and so touching, and the graces of a spirit of rare beauty and refinement. In all the relations of life, in public and in private there was an habitual artlessness in him that won respect and love. He was for some time before his death confined to his room, and there, in serenity and cheerfulness, he awaited the approach of the great change. In this season of weakness, in the spirit of Him who, at the approach of death, was found comforting his followers, he prepared for the press, and published a valuable volume of Sermons of Consolation, and used such little strength as he had, in carving out crucifixes from various rare kinds of wood, and these memorials of Jesus he gave to his friends as humble mementos also of himself.

"It is but a few days since that the grave closed over the mortal remains of Henry Ware. There are some among us who knew him well, and dearly loved him. He was the beloved of a thousand hearts. As a preacher he was to a rare degree impressive and engaging. As the lover of truth and virtue, his activity was untiring. He was ready for every good word and work, and was continually devising new ways of doing good. It is wonderful how much he accomplished, and this too under a weight of bodily infirmities which would have prostrated most other men on their beds. I cannot trust myself to speak of him as I would, for those, who knew him not, could hardly understand me but as using the empty language of eulogy; and yet there is hardly anything I could say in his praise, which the hearts of those who knew him would not justify. They will tell you what a joy and delight it was to be in his presence, how the grasp of his hand, the sound of his voice, which always rung from his heart, was a privilege never to be forgotten! When the ear heard him, then it blessed him, and when the eye saw him, it gave witness to him! But the ear shall hear him, and the eye behold him no more. It is among my cherished remembrances, that at my ordination as the pastor of this church, nearly nineteen years ago, Henry Ware delivered the sermon, and I remember, as though it were yesterday, the eloquent fervor of his tone, when warning us all against uncharitableness he turned suddenly to me, and cried 'My brother, watch against it, preach against it, pray against it!'

"He too has gone to join the great cloud of witnesses. And although we look in vain for those who shall fill the places thus made vacant by death, we trust in God, that the hallowed memories of the departed will long continue to exert a sanctifying power upon us, who survive them, and that in spirit they will encompass us about, and in death as in life, still speak. From the unseen world comes our best strength; and that world is brought nigh to us with new power, when the venerated and beloved have gone to share in the ministration of its influences." — pp. 12–15.

A Sermon occasioned by the death of Washington Allston, delivered in the Church of the Shepard Society, Cambridge, July 16, 1843. By JOHN A. ALBRO, Pastor of the Church. Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown. 1843.

EVERY word that shall be written, relating to the character or the works of Allston, will possess a deep interest. The country has produced very few who in either the walks of professional or private life, in the quiet pursuits of letters or of science, have laid so many claims upon the admiration and respect of the times in which they have lived. As an artist he is known universally, abroad as well as at home; and we suppose the best judgment to be that, in some of the highest departments of his art, particularly in the mysterious power of color and expression, he has had no superior since the great era of the 16th century. Throughout our own country, if not abroad, his name has long been cherished also, as one among our most imaginative poets, and as a writer of prose remarkable for its purity and exquisite finish. It has been less generally known perhaps, — for his life was one almost of entire seclusion, — how truly the perfection which he reached in painting, and in the use of language, was by him sought even more earnestly, and reached in an equal or greater degree, in the best virtues of the man and the sweetest graces of the Christian. He was a devoted lover of his chosen profession, and his days were given with a miserly exclusiveness to its labors. He rarely allowed himself the recreation of even a few hours to visit his friends. But he did not think it necessary, like so many of his great predecessors, because he was thus the servant, almost the slave of art in his deep passion for it, to withhold either the outward conformity of his life, the homage of his strong mind, or the affections of his heart, from the claims of religion. He has not more commended art to the love of his countrymen by the charms he threw around it, than he has religion by the simple piety of his life. We cannot be sufficiently grateful that the influences, that shall flow from so great a name, will be distinctly religious influences, — that the head of art in our country, to whom so many of its younger votaries, in our day and hereafter, will look for the deepest principles of their practice, can never be dissociated in their minds, as they study him, from the image of an exalted Christian faith and virtue, nor from the idea, moreover, of one who found in religion, in the thoughts it creates and the prospects it unfolds, the truest sources of his inspiration.

But we have here no room for remarks of this nature. The Sermon of Mr. Albro is from the words in Revelation, — “I

heard a voice from Heaven, saying unto me, write, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the spirit, that they may rest from their labors." The discourse is an eloquent one; but it is more than that, and better, — it is serious, and earnest, deeply religious in its spirit, and in its train of thought perfectly adapted to the occasion. We can neither present such an analysis of the discourse as we should be glad to do, had we more space at our command, nor make those extracts we had noted conveying in impressive language the best instructions of religion. We can do no more than present to the reader the concluding paragraphs containing the notice of Mr. Allston, — regretting that he who writes so well, should not have written more.

"I am not about to discuss the life, character and works of Washington Allston. I leave that high task to those, who, together with a just appreciation of the highest mental and moral excellence, possess the ability to speak in fitting terms of the great master, whose pen and pencil were instruments of magic power, by which he realized the lofty conceptions of a soul filled with the spirit of truth and beauty.

"But while I pass by those beautiful and sublime works of his, which follow him, and render his name great among men, I may, and must be permitted to speak, in few words, of the glorious work which God wrought in him; and to describe the impression which his religious character, — a subject of far higher importance than his merits as a poet or an artist, — produced upon all who were so happy as to enjoy personal intercourse with him.

"That he was a Christian in the gospel sense of that word, — a true believer in the doctrines of the cross, and a subject of renewing grace, was evident to every one who listened to his conversation, in those moments when he spoke freely of the ground of his hope, or witnessed the symmetry, the transparency, the purity, and the beauty of his daily life.

"I am aware that he was not known to many as an active Christian. His, in more than one respect, was a hidden life. His health, his temperament, and his studies, confined him much at home, and separated him in a great measure from the community. Beyond a devout, and habitual attendance upon the public ordinances of the gospel, of which this congregation, with whom he was so long associated as a member, are witnesses, he did not mingle much with the Christian world; and many, perhaps, thought of him only as an artist, whose whole life was devoted to works which could have, at best, only a temporary value, and whose religion was merely that of the imagination. But this was not true. In the highest, and best sense, he was an active Christian. He had an active faith, deep religious feelings, and a hope full of immortality. His piety was incorporated with his daily toil. He thought, and worked for the glory of God. His studio was a temple, filled not only with the beauty of his own works of art, but made sacred by pious and exhausting efforts to fulfil his high vocation as a Christian. His religion took deep root downwards in meditation and communion with

God, and manifested itself in the shining graces of the Christian life, — in abundant labors, in fervent charity, in pure friendship, and in a faithful testimony for Christ and his cross. It was like the tree described by the apostle, which grew by the river of life, bearing twelve manner of fruit, and yielding its fruit every month.

"His faith was characterized by great simplicity. It rested, not upon the wisdom of man, but upon the Word of God. Although abundantly able to speculate with the wisest and profoundest philosophies, he never speculated upon the great truths of the gospel. He received the kingdom of heaven as a little child, and made the written Word, in its plain and obvious sense, the man of his counsel, and his guide to heaven.

"He was not ashamed of the cross. Christ crucified was to him the wisdom, and the power of God, and the doctrine of atonement, by his sufferings and death, was the foundation of all his hope and peace. Never shall I forget the manner in which he sometimes spoke of the effect which the first revelation of this fundamental doctrine produced upon his soul.

"With his lofty aspirations after the highest excellence in his profession, and with his deep views of the world, and its philosophy, there was united a singular humility and lowliness of spirit. Though he had a profound judgment, a brilliant intellect, and a reputation as wide as the civilized world, yet, to use the words of Jeremy Taylor, 'as if he knew nothing of it, he had a low opinion of himself; and like a fair taper, when he shined to all the room, yet round about his own station he had cast a shadow and a cloud, and he shined to everybody but himself.'

"Towards the close of his life, there was a very visible and rapid development and growth of his religious character. He spoke more freely, and more frequently of his hopes as a Christian. He was more communicative of his feelings. He felt more deeply the value of those great doctrines, which were to him the ground of all true religion, and eternal life. And sometimes in these moments of deep communion with kindred spirits, he seemed rather like a seer than a mere speaker.

"During that memorable evening in which he was — shall I say translated? — he was more than ever earnest in the expression of his own feelings, and anxious that those around him should devote themselves to God, and make perfection in the divine life the great end of their efforts. He was evidently trimming his lamp as if dimly conscious that his Lord was near; and when the summons came, though it came suddenly and unexpectedly, he was, I doubt not, prepared to depart, and to enter upon the work of praise in the temple not made with hands.

"So passed away from among us a mind, beautiful by nature, and adorned by all that learning, wisdom, and taste could confer, but rendered still more beautiful and exalted by the indwelling of the spirit of Christ, and the manifestation of that faith which worketh by love, and purifieth the heart, and overcometh the world."